34485

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR*	Ellen Schoeck Solomon
TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE*	Interaction and Continuity in American Reform, 1825-1870.
UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ*	University of Alberta
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE*	M.A
YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE*	1977
NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE*	Dr. B.M. Smith

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* Oct. 21, 1977 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Ellen Schoeck Solomon

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE*
10422 - 132 St
Edmonton, Alberta

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (3/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

INTERACTION AND CONTINUITY IN AMERICAN REFORM, 1825-1870

by

Ⓒ ELLEN SCHOECK SOLOMON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1977

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled INTERACTION AND CONTINUITY IN AMERICAN REFORM, 1825-1870 ....

submitted by ELLEN SCHOECK SOLOMON ....

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Burton M. Smith
Supervisor

Morton L. Ross

Macleod

Date Oct 14, 1977

ABSTRACT

The three decades preceding the American Civil War witnessed an astonishing multiplication of reform movements. Woman's rights, international peace, elimination of debtor's prison, promotion of health fads, extension of missionary efforts, labor reform, and creation of charitable agencies were only a few of that era's popular causes. The antebellum generation was absorbed in simple benevolence as well as social, religious, political and economic reforms that were radical in content and intent.

From this multiplicity of movements, historians spotlight abolition. Several standard studies of antebellum America have stated that abolition "swallowed up" contemporary reform movements. To the contrary, an examination of abolition, woman's rights and the labor movement reveals a complex, and often positive interaction involving leaders, tactics and ideas. The emergence of woman's rights, for instance, was a direct outgrowth of radical abolition. Development of a mature labor movement was prevented not by the existence of abolition, but by unfavorable judicial decisions, the lure of utopianism, and the successive depressions and financial panics of 1819, 1837, 1857 and 1860.

To clarify the relationships among these three reforms, their common origins must be disclosed and examined. They were not separate, self-contained movements, but were part of a far-reaching humanitarian impulse that was motivated by religious revivalism, Romanticism and Christian perfectionism. Influenced also by the pervasive optimism of that era, humanitarian reformers sought to

uplift, improve and perfect mankind. Coupled with a firm belief in the rhetoric of the American Revolution, reformers and their followers justified their actions by citing the Declaration of Independence. Equality and freedom were their watchwords, and their goal was to close the gap between national principles and practices.

Many studies of the nineteenth century pose another impediment to a clear understanding of the relationships among these three reforms. Political histories, as well as some social and intellectual studies, adopt the Civil War as the century's dividing point. "Antebellum" and "post-Civil War" have become terms and concepts so engrained in American historical scholarship that a study of abolition's ideas, or the ideas of other antebellum reforms, seldom continues past the outbreak of hostilities in 1861. Although the war experience did reshape attitudes toward reform, the break with antebellum ideas and movements was not as final, or as sudden, as is usually suggested. The humanitarian impulse was not completely blotted out; and woman's rights and labor organization, although temporarily undercut by the war, show vigorous postwar growth. Abolition itself, both its leaders and ideas, flourished during and after the war as part of the struggle to win equal rights for freedmen.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Burton M. Smith, for the quality and quantity of his assistance during the preparation of this thesis. His criticisms have been discerning, and his patience endless. I would also like to thank Kathleen Wildasin Jones, who read most of the typescript, and my husband, who freed me from hours of household tasks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ABSTRACT iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

CHAPTER

Introduction: The Ideological Basis of Antebellum Reform 1

I The Historical Background: Motivations to Reform and the Early Abolition Movement 26

II Abolition and the Labor Movement: "The Slavery of Wages" 65

III Abolition and Woman's Rights: Emancipation of the "True Woman" 111

Conclusion: The War Years and Beyond 179

BIBLIOGRAPHY 211

ABBREVIATIONS

For the sake of brevity, the following abbreviations are used for frequently cited journals in the chapter notes:

AHR	American Historical Review
Am. Q.	American Quarterly
Am. Sch.	American Scholar
CWH	Civil War History
JNH	Journal of Negro History
JSH	Journal of Southern History
MVHR	Mississippi Valley Historical Review

Introduction: The Ideological Basis of Antebellum Reform

1

The pursuit of reform in the antebellum United States was a consuming task for many Americans. Decades before America's "Age of Reform" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, reform societies were working to change the personal habits of fellow citizens, to alter America's social and economic structures, and to redefine the political and ideological tenets of the nation. From the numerous reform goals pursued by local associations, several major, national movements emerged. Woman's rights and labor organization, movements that absorbed so much energy and attention from 1890-1920, were targets for reform action earlier in the century as well.[1] Not only did the antebellum period witness the organizational boom of many movements, but it was also an era in which Americans attempted to frame an ideological basis for reform. Loosely-knit reform groups of the eighteenth century, with their nascent philosophies and goals, were infused with new impetus in the 1820's and 1830's. Local, state and national organizations thrived, complete with annual national (often international) conventions, agents and paid lecturers, and weekly or monthly newspapers.

Abolition typified both the passion for organized reform and the effort to shape an ideology, yet its position in the historiography of antebellum reform is unique. Because its central goal was ostensibly realized after the 1863 Emancipation Proclamation, it is generally viewed not only as a successful movement, but also as a distinctly antebellum phenomenon. This view, however, is valid only if abolition is defined as a movement aimed at ending chattel slavery. In fact, abolitionists after 1830 pursued two goals: they not only wanted an immediate end to slavery, but an end to prejudice as well.[2] Freedom and equality were concomitant concerns. There were other groups of nineteenth century Americans who professed to support abolition, but who were not committed to eliminating prejudice. True abolitionist ideology proclaimed that freedom was meaningless without a change in racial attitudes or a tangible means of protecting this suddenly-acquired freedom. For those who believed in this radical definition of abolition, the movement continued beyond the antebellum years in the struggle for Negro equality. In this sense then, not only did abolition contain the historical origins of the Reconstruction civil rights fight, but, because the Emancipation Proclamation did not deal with the problem of equal rights, antebellum abolition can also be classified as a partial failure.[3]

Another feature that sets abolition apart from other major antebellum reform movements is that its fate was inextricably tied to the coming of the Civil War. Historians still disagree on the importance of abolitionist agitation as a direct cause of war, but at least it was a contributing factor to the intense sectionalism that impeded compromise on divisive issues. No other reform group could claim (or be assigned by later historians) such an explosive connection with the war. Association between abolition and the Civil War, however sound, is so binding that it obscures study of abolition as a reform movement.[4] Approached primarily in terms of its developing ideology and its relationship with contemporary movements, a new perspective on early and mid-nineteenth century reform emerges.

Clearly, the Civil War had a profound impact on both American history and historiography. Because of its unique link with that war, abolition seems to dominate all other prewar reforms. Many historians support this thesis, notably Alice Tyler and Avery Craven. Craven comments that, "Because it combined in itself both the moral and the democratic appeal, and because it coincided with sectional rivalry, the abolition movement gradually swallowed up all other reforms." Tyler reiterates this theme by saying that, ". . . eventually the anti-slavery cause absorbed all the enterprise of those who sought to perfect the institutions of the young republic. Or, "The earlier [antebellum] humanitarian causes were swallowed up in the crusade against slavery." As the historians who agree with Tyler and Craven point out, Americans did take particular note of abolitionist activity as sectional attitudes became increasingly polarized.[5] Yet, despite the enormous amount of energy expended by reformers on this crusade, the antebellum abolition movement did not totally absorb other humanitarian causes. During times of political crisis, when national attention was focused on some new development in the polarization that culminated in war, the role of abolitionists was crucial, and other reforms became temporarily ancillary to it. Abolition, however, did not categorically snuff out its sister movements. Temperance, educational reform, even pacifism flourished, and the woman's rights movement was in fact a direct off-shoot of abolition. Early labor organization remained in a fledgling state until the 1850's, but this was due more to economic factors than to the existence of an all-absorbing abolitionist fervor. As well, an abolitionist without interest (and active participation) in other reforms was an anomaly among his colleagues. In short, to examine abolition within the context of other antebellum reforms reveals factors at work other than the growth of sectionalism.

Two reforms, thought to have been "swallowed up" by abolition, will be investigated to ascertain whether or not abolition drained them of energy, leadership, and ideas. The origins of woman's rights and the early labor movement will be outlined, their ideological and organizational development in antebellum America will be probed, and their relationship with abolition will receive detailed attention. As well, an attempt will be made to glance beyond the antebellum history of these organizations to determine whether prewar reform reached a virtual dead-end after Fort Sumter. The thesis will focus primarily on northern white abolitionists and reformers, and will deal with political matters only when they directly impinge on reform issues.

The traditional view of nineteenth century reform assigns the Civil War as an historical dividing point between the earlier era of humanitarian social reform (1820-1860) and the period of the Populist and Progressive movements (1880-1914). These two portions of the century thus represent not only different economic structures and ways of life, but two separate eras of reform as well. The traditional division is generally valid, especially for political history, but the partition of the century into two neat halves impedes study of prewar reforms past 1861. The entrenched periodization itself suggests that the antebellum and post-Civil War periods are distinct, a view supported by the numerous studies of the nineteenth century which explore one era or the other, rarely attempting to trace antebellum trends during and beyond the war. Studies that have disregarded the accepted periodization have been histories concerned with examining the ways in which antebellum ideas and attitudes changed. Only a few historians have proposed that links between the two eras may be stronger and more numerous than usually posited, and a portion of this paper will explore the continuity between antebellum woman's rights and labor organization, and the postwar versions of these movements.[6]

Historiographically, it seems that it was not abolition which absorbed other reforms, but the Civil War which swallowed up the abolition movement. The abolitionists, their ideas, ideals and goals receive only brief mention in Civil War and post-Civil War histories. It is true that the postwar era witnessed drastic changes in intellectual, social and economic trends, but the full extent of this transformation was not complete by 1865. Labor organization, the fight for equal rights for Negroes, and woman's rights continued in the decades after the war despite new ideas and attitudes that were emerging about the value of humanitarian reform. These movements certainly changed as they entered the postwar period, but they drew from earlier experiences as well. Even though the war suppressed much of the original religious reform impulse, many movements resurfaced in recognizable form, modified by new ideas and historical conditions, yet grounded by their prewar tradition.

In searching for a continuing tradition in nineteenth century reform, the single most consistent factor among the multiplicity of reforms is their plasticity, the changeableness of goals and tactics, and of the governing ideas and basic assumptions necessary to the existence of a movement. There are several reasons for the protean nature of reform. Paramount was the absence of a settled society. America was in a state of flux, with a mushrooming population eager to make social mobility work to its advantage, burgeoning industrialization, and increasing numbers of immigrants, new states and territories. In a nation where historical change occurred so fast, it was difficult to maintain a radical tradition.[7] A corollary to this rapid change lay in the lack of traditional avenues of reform. A starting point for every reformer was the Declaration of Independence (although reasons for citing this document varied), but organized, accepted bases for reform were notably absent. Further, the motivations to better society were numerous, resulting in reforms that were diverse and individualized. Combined, these conditions resulted in constantly shifting reform terminology. In order to understand the distinctions between radical, moderate and conservative methods and goals, familiarity with the ideological origins of American reform (especially the philosophical underpinnings of the Declaration of Independence), is necessary. As well, an examination must be made concerning the definitions suggested both by the reformers themselves and by historians who have studied their movements.

The Declaration of Independence has always been an ideological touchstone for American reformers. Without significant exception, reform groups have used this document as justification for their demands, programs, or actions.[8] Suffragists claimed the franchise on the basis of the natural rights theory in the Declaration, and abolitionists were adamant that the rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" be accorded to slaves. In a Fourth of July address, William Lloyd Garrison, a most ardent abolitionist, told his audience, "If I am asked to prove [the slave's] title to liberty, my answer is, that the fourth of July is not a day to be wasted in establishing 'self-evident truths.'"[9] Referring to the Declaration in an essay detailing the chasm between rich and poor in mid-nineteenth century America, the radical labor leader William Sylvis bitterly related how the ideals of America had no reality for workingmen. "Thus do we find our boasted institutions of equal rights to be the merest skeleton of liberty," said Sylvis, "which by their letter declare that equal rights and privileges shall be guaranteed to all, but by their operation create aristocracy, special privileges, extortion, monopoly, and robbery."[10] In fact, for any unjustly treated, discontent segment of the American population, the Declaration contained the ideological basis for a new and better order: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."[11]

The natural rights philosophy expounded in the final draft of Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence used the accepted premises of the natural order as a justification for independence from Great Britain, and natural rights philosophy became a justification for political authority. To Tom Paine, the events of 1776 constituted not "merely a separation from England," but "a revolution in the principles and practice of governments."[12] The revolutionary ideology from which the Declaration was derived had its source in both John Locke and the religious dissenters who modified Locke's ideas.[13] On certain key points, these two strands of thought diverged, and it was the dissenters, not Locke, who were the source for the Declaration's "intuitive ethical individualism."[14] Dissenters added moral significance to Locke's theory of government, declaring that self-evident truths were perceived in an intellectual way "akin to the Quaker's 'inner light.'"[15] In a debate that was echoed in America, the dissenters searched for a way to insert an innate moral sense, a freedom of conscience, into Locke's philosophy. The problem was not so much Locke's conscientious separation of the secular and the religious in his philosophies, but rather that his theory of knowledge seemed to deny existence of "self-evident" truths. Locke, who proposed that ideas derived solely from experience, believed that man began life with a "blank mind" and learned by means of pain or pleasure what ideas to adopt.[16] Truth was revealed not by God, nor had He "stamped upon the minds of all men certain intuitively perceived intellectual and moral ideas" which correspond to the revealed truth.[17] The dilemma of Locke's philosophical heirs was that if man were born with his mind a blank, "what happened to self-evident inalienable rights? and to a theory of revolution that presumed the existence of those rights?" Dissenters proposed that secular truths were "intuitively accessible to average men" in the same way men sensed religious truths.[18]

Another ambiguity in the revolutionary ideology was the question of whether or not the ownership of private property was a natural right. Jefferson, who believed that property was a social convention and not an inherent human right, made no mention of property in the Declaration. Locke, however, in his Second Treatise, devoted a chapter to rationalizing the accumulation of material wealth.[19] As one American historian has noted, the revolutionary ideology was not the greatest help to the black man. "For one thing, the ideas of freedom and equal rights were intimately linked with the concept of private material property. As Locke had said, men possessed a 'property' in both themselves and their possessions; they had a natural right to their life, liberty, and 'estates.'"[20] Locke had occasion to practically apply his theories when he drafted the Fundamental Constitution of South Carolina. In it he gave citizens complete religious liberty, plus "absolute power and authority" over Negro slaves. This concept of property, though not an explicit part of the Declaration of Independence, was nevertheless part of the general eighteenth century revolutionary philosophy, and recognition of chattel slavery was later written into the Constitution.[21]

One of Thomas Jefferson's first drafts of the Declaration included a denunciation of both slavery and King George's failure to halt the slave trade.[22] The passage was deleted after objections by South Carolina and Georgia, but the incident raised several significant points. The revolutionary ideology, based on inalienable human rights, seemed logically to encompass freedom for all men, and although the Declaration ostensibly included black men, nothing positive was mentioned about the rights of Negroes.[23] The Declaration was necessarily ambiguous on this topic since it had to win support from all classes, including slaveholders. Americans and foreigners alike, however, described the discrepancy between the Declaration and more than 100,000 slaves. John Stuart Mill called the United States a "country where institutions profess to be founded on equality, and which yet maintains the slavery of black men. . . ." A Philadelphia newspaper in 1768 asked, "How suits it with the glorious cause of Liberty to keep your fellow men in bondage, men equally the work of your great Creator, men formed for freedom as yourselves."[24] After the Revolution, antislavery men stressed that Negroes were "born equally free with whites. . . ." and that European philosophies were no longer needed to prove the fact, for "it is declared and recorded as the sense of America."[25] Slaves themselves reiterated the sentiment. A group of blacks petitioned the Massachusetts' legislature in 1777, pointing out that "every principle from which America has acted in the course of her unhappy difficulties with Great-Britain, pleads stronger than a thousand arguments in favor of your Petitioners." Later in the eighteenth century, after two decades of post-revolutionary antislavery activity, one abolitionist commented that "If anything can sound like a solecism in the ears of mankind, it will be this story -- That in the United States of America, societies are formed for the promotion of freedom."[26] Jefferson's dilemma is crucial to understanding the national attitude: "He hated slavery" and "never for a moment considered the possibility that [Negroes] might rightfully be enslaved," but he "thought blacks inferior to whites."[27] Racial prejudice complicated the obvious economic factors involved in possible emancipation. The duality between the belief (that the black man should have equal rights) and the attitude (that he was inferior) persisted in many forms long after the revolutionary period, and the inability of Americans to reconcile the conflict characterized the nineteenth century as well as the eighteenth.

The Declaration of Independence thus represented a set of ideals to be sought after, not a reflection of actual society. It is this gap between national principles and practices that reformers have tried since 1776 to narrow. Abraham Lincoln described the Declaration as defining an ideal to be attained "as soon as circumstances should permit."[28] Several historians have framed American history in terms of the process by which rights were extended, viewing American democracy as evolutionary, slowly but constantly expanding from rather crude, actual beginnings to reach the ideals of the Declaration. By 1820, for instance, northern states had freed their slaves and instituted many legal reforms, especially regarding criminals.[29] Also, the franchise was becoming less restricted by property and religious qualifications. (In fact, the central question here, a restatement of the dissenters' dilemma, involved the rights of man versus the rights of property: was voting a natural right?) There were, however, some Americans who refused to wait for the opportunities for social reform to surface. While conservatives and moderates bided their time, the radicals were in too much of a hurry to wait for the proper circumstances to arise.

Subsequent American reformers drew inspiration and ideas from the ideals in the Declaration's preamble as well as from the more diversified, sometimes conflicting tenets of eighteenth century philosophy. After 1776 most reformers, no matter how dissimilar in goals and ideas, grounded their movements in the Declaration. This fact indicates that there was a common, continuing tradition in American reform.[30] Yet there was neither continuity in the ways in which reformers applied the Declaration, nor was there an evolution in the Declaration's ideology. No additions were made, the ideals were unchanged. A wide variety of reforms persisted, but the original statement of natural rights remained static. The dynamic elements in the reform tradition were the myriad interpretations and applications of the Declaration. By 1830, when reform was infused with a new religious impulse, small, scattered groups of reformers began to merge, and inchoate reform philosophies started to coalesce into identifiable types of reform. Modern terminology describing nineteenth century reform must be flexible, however, for reform objectives and tactics fluctuated constantly, making it difficult for historians to pin down static philosophies. The intensely individual approaches of humanitarian reformers make rigid definitions of "radical" and "moderate" unusable. Factionalism within movements was rife, resulting in several kinds of abolition, woman's rights, or labor ideologies. The definitions suggested here will be of the most general sort; specific explanations of terms can be understood only within the context of their historical conditions, and will be detailed in succeeding chapters.

In the 1820's there were many motivations to social reform. The romantic belief in man's perfectibility, devotion to the idea of progress, the religious impulse of the great revivals, and the transcendental conviction that reform began with individual regeneration -- all these concepts stimulated men to change society.[31] Probably the broadest group of reformers was the humanitarians, whose straightforward philosophy was summed up in one of Wendell Phillips' Fourth of July addresses: ". . . whenever you find a man downtrodden, he is your brother. . . ."[32] To Phillips, an abolitionist and postwar labor leader, the abolition movement qualified as a humanitarian reform, for slavery was both inhumane and a denial of natural rights. Samuel Gridley Howe, an abolitionist more famous for his work with the blind and insane, felt that "Humanity demands that every creature in human shape should command our respect; we should recognise as a brother every human being upon whom God has stamped the human impress."[33] It was a moral duty for the strong to help the weak, a sentiment reinforced by the 1820's religious revivals. This new Christian spirit also inspired the moral reformers, whose varied goals (abolition, temperance, distribution of Bibles and religious tracts), were all based on the imperatives of Christian morality.

Transcendental reform contained two divergent philosophical strands both founded in the same premise. Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his essay "Man the Reformer," told his audience that reform meant removing "impediments" to natural perfection. The notion was a romantic one: destroy the "oppressive order" and natural possibilities will flourish, allowing progress free reign.[34] In another essay, Emerson proposed that true reform could not occur "whilst a man, not himself renovated, attempts to renovate things around him. . . . Every project in the history of American reform, no matter how violent and surprising, is good when it is the dictate of a man's genius and constitution, but very dull and suspicious when adopted from another."[35] Self-culture was a requisite for reform. After this inner realization reform moved past the individual, "and worked outward through the family, the neighborhood and ultimately into the social and political life of the community."[36] This move beyond self-culture was not included in Emerson's early philosophy, but other transcendentalists, like radical Unitarian minister Theodore Parker, felt that an intellectual had a responsibility to insure that "individual conscience . . . [created] a social conscience. . . ."[37] These three categories of social reformers -- humanitarian, moral, and transcendental -- were not rigidly defined, exclusive groups; and there was an open interchange of ideas and individuals. The general pattern of reform that emerged by the end of the 1820's was this:

> Moral earnestness and a thorough belief in the perfectibility of man were linked with the unshakable conviction that American civilization was the best the world had ever seen, and would be completely perfect if only it corrected the few flaws that the reformer sought to remedy.[38]

Perfectionism, belief in progress, evangelical Protestantism and transcendentalism, though they spurred diverse kinds of movements, were all linked by their egalitarianism.

There are other labels attached to reformers that must be isolated and defined. The terms "radical," "conservative," and "moderate" are without exception the most variable, protean terms in the nomenclature of reform. The conventional meanings are not adequate, primarily because what was radical in America usually became part of the status quo within several years.[39] Gradual emancipation, regarded as radical in the 1820's, appeared positively meek beside Garrison's explosive immediatism of the early 1830's; but to John Brown, immediatists like Garrison and Phillips were "all talk, what is needed is action -- action."[40] What was once radical, one American historian has pointed out, becomes accepted,

> And so Boston, which once persecuted Anne Hutchinson, Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison, has erected statues to them, and on their pedestals they wear so dignified a mien that James Russell Lowell wrote of one of the sculptures:
>
> > There's Garrison, his features very
> > Benign for an incendiary.[41]

What was termed radical was thus relative to the status quo.

Emerson viewed the conservative as holding on to the past, while the radical (or reformer) looked to the future. This is a valid distinction, but what in fact separated the conservative and moderate from the radical was the method used to induce change, "by catastrophic change, or by gradual, tiny, but steady developments."[42] Radicals went to extremes, not just in the goals they sought, but also in their methods. Practicality, compromise and gradualism were out of the question to men "of principle who followed conscience in the search for an ideal, no matter how remote."[43] Radical victory was rarely achieved swiftly or completely, but through his "steadfastness," he "sowed innumerable reforms which the [less radical] reformer later reaped."[44] An historian of American radicalism claims that "it is the radicals who insist, from time to time, on asking the necessary but awkward questions and dragging the skeletons from the darkest closets. . . . Radicals alone can be counted on to stand by their own clear if partial insights, to keep unpopular causes alive."[45] For radicals, the way to keep unpopular causes alive was through agitation. Wendell Phillips described the agitator as one who "with no bread to earn, no candidate to elect, no party to save, no object but truth -- [tears] a question open and [riddles] it with light."[46] The function of a radical agitator was to change public opinion by means of vivid rhetoric and intense moral suasion.[47] Thus radicals were extreme in both goals and tactics, to the extent that the term "moderate" also became relative, referring to ends and means of reform that were "less extreme" than those of the radicals. A conservative was similarly defined, although this term evoked the additional connotation of conserving the old order, of holding on to past traditions and entrenched institutions.[48] Specific kinds of reform -- radical, conservative, or moderate -- will be more closely defined in subsequent chapters.

iii

In one sense, reform in the United States began with the nation's inception and has not stopped. Change proceeded through the political and legal systems, albeit slowly. When these institutional channels for reform did not deal quickly and completely with an unjust or oppressive order, discontented groups often formed associations or coalesced into movements, either to influence the established channels of reform or to work outside them.[49]

Antebellum reform movements were part of this continuing process of change. Moderates and conservatives worked within the political arena, while radical reformers usually operated outside institutional channels.[50] Abolition, which encompassed both radicals and moderates, was not the all-consuming, self-contained movement that many historians picture, nor was the Civil War a dead-end in the history of American reform. Abolition interacted with other movements in terms of leadership, rhetoric, motivation and ideology, and despite the undeniable intellectual and economic changes wrought by the war, the governing ideas of woman's rights, labor and abolition sustained those movements beyond Appomattox.

NOTES: INTRODUCTION

[1] One historian who suggests that the American reform tradition has been continuing since the Declaration of Independence, and that antebellum movements were part of this process, is David Brion Davis. In his Ante-Bellum Reform (New York, 1967), Davis questions the validity of viewing "ante-bellum reform as a self-contained phenomenon," proposing that "significant continuities" between these two eras of reform may have been overlooked. (See pp. 3-6.) Davis thinks that as late nineteenth century reform "became more pragmatic and institutional in approach, it was often necessary [for reformers] to repudiate the supposedly naive and visionary methods of the past," p. 3. Staughton Lynd, in his essay, "Freedom Now: The Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism," in Alfred Young, ed., Dissent: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism (DeKalb, Ill., 1968), pp. 1-36, also sees a continuous reform tradition based on the Revolution. Lynd lists the varied reforms that have adopted the "rhetoric of the Declaration," pp. 3-6.

[2] Winthrop D. Jordan, in The White Man's Burden: Historical Origins of Racism in the United States (New York, 1974) probes the evolution of white attitudes toward black men that entrenched racism by the Revolution. Jordan points out that color and slavery were not always connected, and that among all slaves and indentured servants Negroes were slowly singled out by "degrading distinctions," with prejudiced social practices later legalized. "By the end of the seventeenth century dark complexion had become an independent rationale for enslavement...," p. 52. Jordan examines the psychological and intellectual aspects of this evolving prejudice, stressing that the "tyranny of slavery" affected not only blacks, but locked whites into a rigid role as well. (See, for instance, pp. 166-170.)

[3] Merton L. Dillon, in "The Failure of the American Abolitionists" JSH, 25 (1959): 159-77, contends that the goals of abolition, "to spread the doctrine of the sin of slavery and ... to eradicate the nearly universal prejudice...." (p. 167), were forfeited in the 1840's when the movement became political, opting for direct action over moral suasion. Dillon's ideas will be examined more fully in chapter I. It should be noted that by the 1860's many abolitionists, including William Lloyd Garrison, felt that their task was achieved with the Emancipation Proclamation, but the American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS) continued under Wendell Phillips' leadership after Garrison resigned. Phillips and other abolitionists continued to fight for equal rights in the 1870's.

[4] In the 1920's and 1930's a "revisionist" view of abolition emerged in the writings of some historians (notably Avery Craven and James G. Randall), who saw the Civil War not as a vindication of the Declaration's ideals, but rather as an avoidable tragedy caused primarily by irresponsible, fanatical abolitionists. This viewpoint is the most extreme statement of the causal connection between abolition and the war.

[5] Avery Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War*, 2d ed. (Chicago, 1957), p. 150, and Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment: Phases of American Social History from the Colonial Period to the Outbreak of the Civil War* (New York, 1944), p. 226 and p. 549. Numerous historians agree with Tyler and Craven, including the authors of most general social histories, but they all look at abolition primarily in terms of its connection with the Civil War. Carl Degler, for instance, in *Out of Our Past: Forces that Shaped Modern America*, rev. ed., (New York, 1959), p. 159, says that "Although the objects of reform were numerous in this era of ferment, there was one which swallowed up all the rest." Degler then summarizes the political ways in which slavery and abolition helped split the nation. Charles C. Cole, in *The Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860* (New York, 1954), p. 129, also refers to reform societies being "swallowed up by the expanding antislavery movement." Russell Blaine Nye reiterates this view in *Society and Culture in America, 1830-1860* (New York, 1974), p. 61, where he says that "Until the mid-forties antislavery was simply one of many such reform enthusiasms.... Gradually it rose to eclipse the others...." Ralph Henry Gabriel, in *The Course of American Democratic Thought*, 2d ed. (New York, 1940), p. 209, states that Theodore Parker's 1830's crusade against slums was absorbed by the antislavery movement. The historians who present abolition as the dominant antebellum reform also show the Civil War as a rigid historical dividing point. Degler, p. 187, notes that "Once the war came ... it brought to an abrupt close one period of American history and opened the door to another of a much different order." Tyler, on p. 549, expresses the same judgment, as does Cole on p. 221 of his study. There are a few monographs and articles that do attempt to bridge the Civil War in terms of intellectual or social reform. See George M. Fredrickson's *The Inner Civil War: Northern Intellectuals and the Crisis of the Union* (New York, 1965); Robert Winston Mardock, *The Reformers and the American Indian* (Columbia, Mo., 1971); David J. Pivar, *Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868-1900* (Westport, Conn., 1973); and Herbert G. Gutman, "Protestantism and the American Labor Movement: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age," *AHR*, 72 (1966-1967): 74-101.

[6] There is no study concerned solely with the interaction between abolition and other reform movements. Davis, *Ante-Bellum Reform*, p. 10, is the only historian I have encountered who supports my thesis: "Finally, we must ultimately ask whether the Civil War represents an abrupt terminus to an entire cycle of reform. Is it valid ... to speak of ante-bellum reform as a self-contained phenomenon, or have we overlooked significant continuities between the first so-called "age of reform" and the later emergence of Reform Darwinism, the Social Gospel, and Progressivism?" Two other historians indicate a similar sentiment. Dwight Dumond, in his *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (Ann Arbor, 1939), p. 1, n. 1., claims that antislavery was not a "self-contained" movement, "nor did it exist independently of other phases of a general movement for social reform." Gilman Ostrander, in *The Rights of Man in America, 1606-1861* (Columbia, Mo., 1960), p. 296, makes a similar suggestion. Also see Aileen S. Kraditor, *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism: Garrison*

and His Critics on Strategy and Tactics, 1834-1850 (New York, 1967), p. 11, who says that "While I willingly accord the abolitionists a unique and honored place in American history, I believe there is much to be learned by studying certain problems that they faced in common with other radical and reform groups: the relation of ends to means, of goals to tactics." James McPherson, in The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP (Princeton, N.J., 1975), p. 4, states that his study centers on "the racial rather than [the] reform legacy of abolitionism...." He then posits that "An interesting book could be written about the diffusion of the antislavery impulse into the temperance movement, civil service reform, the women's rights movement, labor reform, and a host of other causes."

[7] This idea is posed by Henry F. May in "The End of American Radicalism," Am. Q. 2 (1950): 297.

[8] Staughton Lynd discusses this concept in Young, Dissent, p. 4. Also see notes 9 and 10, below.

[9] Quoted in Ephraim Douglass Adams, The Power of Ideals in American History (Port Washington, New York, 1969), p. 51. In this thesis, brackets indicate my own insertions, interpolations made for the purposes of explanation or clarification.

[10] William Sylvis, "What is Money," in James C. Sylvis, ed., The Life, Speeches, Labors and Essays of William H. Sylvis (Philadelphia, 1872; reprint ed., New York, 1968), p. 354.

[11] The next sentence in the preamble contains the justification for revolution: "That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government...." Revolutionary aspects of the Declaration are considered in note 38, below.

[12] Quoted by Staughton Lynd in Young, Dissent, p. 3.

[13] Locke, the "prophet of reason" and founder of British empiricism, finished his Essay Concerning Human Understanding while in exile from England. After the 1688 Glorious Revolution he returned to his country and wrote his Two Treatises on Government, an apology for the revolution. Carl Becker, in The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas (New York, 1940), contends that the Declaration rests solidly on Locke's ideas; Bernard Bailyn, in The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), sees the eighteenth century pamphleteers, who modified and popularized Locke, as additional sources of the revolutionary ideology; and Staughton Lynd stresses the influence of the dissenters, especially Richard Price, in Young, Dissent.

[14] Young, *Dissent*, p. 2.

[15] Ibid., p. 14.

[16] For an explanation of Locke's theory of knowledge, see ibid., p. 7, and Becker, *Declaration of Independence*, p. 55.

[17] Ibid., p. 7, and Becker, *Declaration of Independence*, p. 56.

[18] Ibid., pp. 13 and 7.

[19] Ibid., pp. 9-10, p. 25.

[20] Jordan, *White Man's Burden*, p. 138.

[21] The reference to South Carolina's Constitution is in Lynd's article in Young, *Dissent*, p. 10, where Lynd also cites several similar examples. The Constitution of the United States, which dealt with the slave trade (to be halted in 1808), also "forced men to say it outright: the Negro as a slave was three-fifths a person" (Jordan, *White Man's Burden*, p. 128).

[22] Sidney Lens, *Radicalism in America*, rev. ed. (New York, 1969), p. 105.

[23] Women were another excluded group. In several states where women owned enough property to be qualified voters, the franchise was taken away after the Revolution. See Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, p. 425.

[24] John Stuart Mill is quoted in Degler, *Out of Our Past*, p. 160. The quote from the Philadelphia newspaper can be found in Jordan, *White Man's Burden*, p. 119.

[25] Jordan, *White Man's Burden*, pp. 119-120.

[26] Ibid., p. 131. The petition is reprinted on p. 120.

[27] Ibid., p. 166 and p. 167.

[28] Becker, *Declaration of Independence*, pp. 242-243, n. 4.

[29] The discussion here follows John Bach McMaster, *The Acquisition of Political, Social and Industrial Rights of Man in America* (New York, 1961), pp. 1-86, including the introduction by Louis Filler. McMaster recognized that revolutionary Americans were divided by special privilege and "bad legislation." But equal rights could not be attained overnight, nor could they be immediately legislated without social disruption. McMaster saw the newly-won political rights of the Revolution as the basis for acquisition of equal social rights, which in turn helped win more equitable "industrial" (economic) rights. Also see Ostrander, *Rights of Man in America*, introduction.

[30] See n. 1., above.

[31] The dictionary definition of reform is assumed here: "to persuade or educate to a better life, to change society." Romantic and transcendental reform are discussed in John L. Thomas, "Romantic Reform in America, 1815-1865," Am. Q. 17 (1965): 656-681, especially p. 656 and p. 671. Arthur M. Schlesinger and Dixon Ryan Fox, eds., A History of American Life, vol. 5: The Completion of Independence, 1790-1830, by John Allen Krout and Dixon Ryan Fox (New York, 1944), deals with the relationship between religious revival and humanitarian reform in the chapter on "The Conservative Tradition." Also see Whitney R. Cross, The Burned-over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850 (Ithaca, N.Y., 1950), and Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth Century America (New York, 1957). Arthur Ekirch, in The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860 (New York, 1951), suggests that "conservatives and radical reformers" all interpreted the ideas of progress to suit their own ends and interests, p. 194.

[32] Quoted in Irving Bartlett, "Wendell Phillips and the Eloquence of Abuse," Am. Q. 10 (1959): 516.

[33] Quoted in Thomas, "Romantic Reform," pp. 665-66. Jordan, White Man's Burden, p. 32, notes that "So much was slavery a complete loss of liberty that it seemed to Englishmen somehow akin to loss of humanity."

[34] Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 656. This is the context of Emerson's remark in "Man the Reformer," The Portable Emerson, selected and introduced by Mark Van Doren (New York, 1946), p. 83: "The power which is at once spring and regulator in all efforts of reform is the conviction that there is an infinite worthiness in man ... and that all particular reforms are the removing of some impediment."

[35] Ralph Waldo Emerson, "New England Reformers," in Essays and Journals, compiled and introduced by Lewis Mumford (Garden City, N.Y., 1968), p. 370 and p. 367.

[36] Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 671.

[37] Ibid., p. 674. Like the Lockean dissenters, Parker believed that an imminent God inspired men. As Thomas notes on p. 674, the lynchpin of Parker's philosophy was that "Every man may safely trust his conscience, properly informed, because it is the repository for divine truth."

[38] Robert Riegel, Young America, 1830-1840 (Norman, Okla., 1949), p. 18. There was an acceptance of the basic order in this kind of reform; it was not revolutionary. In fact, few groups adopted the justification for revolution contained in the preamble to the Declaration. Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 659, believes that immediate abolition's disregard for precedent and established

institutions indicates latent revolutionary tendencies, a view supported by David Brion Davis' "The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought," MVHR 49 (1962): 209-230. Thomas also sees the possibility of political revolution in abolitionist Theodore Parker's Christian Party, which Parker hoped would one day move beyond his own transcendental regeneration to encompass all Americans. "When unjust laws interpose barriers to progress, reformers must demolish them," said Parker in justification for his Vigilance Committee, which fought the 1850 Fugitive Slave Law. Thomas interprets that "Individual conscience thus creates a social conscience and a collective will to right action," with moral and political revolution a distinct possibility. By the Civil War, however, revolution against established government was no longer acceptable to most Americans, especially Northerners. Southerners, in fact, quoted from the Declaration to justify their own actions.

[39] Allen Guttman, The Conservative Tradition in America (New York, 1967), has an excellent introduction defining traditional concepts of liberal and conservative. In Europe these terms have retained much of their nineteenth century significance. In America, they have become popularized, referring to a person, group or party's attitude toward change. A conservative thus defends the status quo, while a liberal welcomes change and reform of traditional institutions. These terms, Guttman points out, are thus relative. As absolutes, as historically identifiable ideologies, Liberalism derives from Locke: belief in natural rights, liberty, and equality, reason as the key to nature's moral and physical laws, reason and rational inquiry over experience and tradition -- all these were tenets of Lockean thought. Liberals, however, usually had a strong respect for property, which often conflicted with the notion of equality and freedom for blacks. Conservatism derived from Edmund Burke who, by the time he had verbalized his reaction to the French Revolution, totally denied Locke, the Declaration of Independence, and all consequences of the French Revolution. "Levelling," he said, was against the natural order. He rejected the rights of revolution and social contract, and was opposed to Locke's ideas of liberty and equality. For other discussions of conservatism in America, see Krout and Fox, Completion of Independence, chap. 10; Fredrickson, Inner Civil War, chap. 2; and T.B. Bottomore, Critics of Society: Radical Thought in North America (New York, 1968), p. 79.

[40] Brown's "action," of course, was the raid on Harper's Ferry. His quote is in Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 122. For information on Benjamin Lundy's gradualism, see p. 111, or consult Merton Dillon, Benjamin Lundy and the Struggle for Black Freedom (Urbana, Ill., 1966).

[41] Arthur Schlesinger, The American as Reformer (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), p. 68. Merton Dillon, "Failure of the American Abolitionists," p. 159, says that "As the end of the Civil War drew near, the once despised abolitionists appeared in retrospect to have been early prophets of the future."

[42] Edward Branch, The Sentimental Years, 1835-1860 (New York, 1934), p. 193. It should be noted that the term "moderate" referred only to change slowly achieved, and did not have the connotation of holding on to past institutions and traditions reserved to the term "conservative." See n. 50, below.

[43] Riegel, Young America, p. 302.

[44] Sidney Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 2.

[45] Henry May, "End of American Radicalism," pp. 291-292.

[46] Arthur Schlesinger, The American as Reformer, p. 35.

[47] Irving Bartlett, "Wendell Phillips and the Eloquence of Abuse," pp. 517-518, and Fredrickson, Inner Civil War, p. 18.

[48] Stanley M. Elkins, in part four of Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life, 2d ed. (Chicago, 1968), asserts that the anti-institutionalism and romantic antinomianism of abolitionists prevented rational compromise on the issue of slavery, thus leading to war. While this thesis offers no outright criticism of Elkins' statements, its emphasis on the diversity of abolitionist positions -- political, moral and social -- is an indirect refutation of Elkins' argument. Kraditor, in Means and Ends in American Abolitionism, rebuts Elkins' thesis on these same grounds. In her study, which centers on the conflicting beliefs, tactics and strategies within abolitionist factions, Kraditor points out that "Far from repudiating institutions, most abolitionists wished to purify them," p. 17. Two recent, carefully argued studies of Elkins' anti-institutional thesis are James Brewer Stewart, "Politics and Belief in Abolitionism: Stanley Elkins' Concept of Antiinstitutionalism and Recent Interpretations of American Antislavery," South Atlantic Quarterly (winter 1976): 74-97, and Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "Stanley Elkins' Slavery: The Antislavery Interpretation Reexamined," Am. Q. 25 (1973): 154-175. Elkins' recent concern has not been a defense of part four of Slavery, but rather a discussion of the merits and pitfalls of the "damage school" and the "culture school." The former asserts that slavery was a "demoralizing and brutalizing" institution, and the latter emphasizes the "creative energy, the development of a distinctive cultural identity" spurred by resistance to slavery. The quotes can be found on p. 40 of Elkins' article, "The Slavery Debate," Commentary 60 (Dec. 1975): 40-54.

[49] Roberta Ash, Social Movements in America (Chicago, Ill., 1972), defines a social movement as "a set of attitudes and self-conscious action on the part of a group of people directed toward change in the social structure and/or ideology of a society and carried on outside of ideologically legitimated channels or which uses these in innovative ways," p. 1. Revolutionary and reform movements are defined in terms of Marxist thought: "A revolutionary movement is one that is aimed at changing the relations of production and the

political system; it is directed against the central value system and the central institutions of the society. It uses methods that are not defined as legitimate (or even quasi-legitimate) according to the ideology.... A reform movement is one that is not aimed at changing the relations of production or at displacing the incumbent ruling class. It uses methods that are fundamentally legitimate ... and, generally, it is aimed at manipulating or cajoling elites," p. 9. The greater a movement's threat to class structure, the more likely it will fail, says Ash, p. 12. She believes that no class or sub-class in America has seriously sought to realter the social structure, p. 32. Ash also discusses a variety of ways in which a movement is transformed (formalization, suppression, factionalization, radicalization, goal realization), pp. 23-25. She suggests that, "Even when [a] transformation produces the end of movement action, still we must explain the fate of the attitudes...." (p. 23). This last approach is especially apt for studying the continuing history of antebellum movements.

[50] Although the term "radical" had no static meaning in early and mid-nineteenth century America, some fixed attributes can be isolated. A radical reformer was characterized by his insistence on quick and thorough change. Both his methods and goals could be extreme, especially when compared to the contemporary status quo. A person of steadfast principles, the radical reformer was loath to compromise. His aim was to effect far-reaching change immediately in order to insure a better future. Moderates and conservatives, on the other hand, chose methods and goals that were more acceptable to the popular mind. Change was to be effected gradually by slow, steady developments. Conservatives were further characterized by a tendency to "conserve" some part of the old order, or to maintain a tradition.

CHAPTER I

The Historical Background:

Motivations to Reform and the Early Abolition Movement

i

"Ours is the age of societies," declared the English social organizer Sir James Stephen in 1849. "For the redress of every oppression that is done under the sun, there is a public meeting. . . . For the diffusion of every blessing . . . there is a committee."[1] Five years earlier, the American transcendentalist Ralph Waldo Emerson delivered a lecture on "New England Reformers" in which he stressed that each individual has his own idea of reform: "Even the insect world," he exaggerated, "was to be defended -- that had been too long neglected, and a society for the protection of ground-worms, slugs and mosquitos was to be incorporated without delay."[2] The spectrum of American reform was indeed broad, encompassing the great social causes (such as abolition, temperance, peace, education, labor organization); the strictly religious societies (American Bible Society, American Home Missionary Society, American Tract Society); a host of charitable organizations (the Association for the Relief of Respectable, Aged, and Indigent Females was one); religious and social utopias (Oneida, Brook Farm); and innumerable peripheral, often faddish reforms, including anti-coffee, tea and tobacco groups, pro-fruit and anti-fruit societies, farina-ism, Grahamism, anti-corset or pro-sunlight associations.[3] Although it is usually the people involved with charities or with organizations for the handicapped who claim the label "humanitarian," nearly every major social, moral, economic, or religious reformer in antebellum America considered himself a humanitarian.[4] Each was in some way concerned with uplifting his fellow man, ameliorating life's circumstances, or righting man's inhumanity to man. Despite diversity in goals and ideas, and despite transformations in the character of early humanitarian movements (labor organization, for instance, evolved from societies for mutual aid into a class-based reform), desire to improve the human condition was their shared basis. Common characteristics among antebellum reforms are not easily perceived; rather, it is the dissimilarity which is so obvious. To discover the reasons for this variety, and more important, to understand the nature of antebellum reform, it is necessary to uncover the underlying motivations.

Optimism was undoubtedly the keynote of the era. In an 1845 issue of the Harbinger, Fourierist Albert Brisbane wrote that

> The United States of America is the scene for ... great work: it is to take the lead in the final operation of the universal enfranchisement of the masses: the child of Europe, it has escaped its oppressive and tyrannical institutions, and, -- grown up in freedom and independence, in the enjoyment of political liberty, and the possession of popular intelligence, -- it is prepared to fulfill its sacred function, the social pioneer of its less favored brother nations, the social saviour of the enslaved, degraded and suffering millions throughout the world! Let its leading minds be worthy of its noble mission....[5]

"Young America," with her immeasurable natural resources (especially land), expanding population (13 to 17 million between 1830-1840), and ideal government (democracy was the form of government thought most approved by God), -- dynamic Young America embodied the positive characteristics absent in decadent Europe. "Few doubted that the future would be better than the past. 'Progress' was in the air, and change meant 'improvement'. . . . God would not permit his chosen people to go anywhere but upward and onward."[6] The expansion that was everywhere evident vindicated democratic government, and in popular conception America was to be the example for the world.

De Tocqueville, for one, identified progress with growth of equality and democracy, a connection made by most Americans as well. Pride in America's present was underscored by faith in her future possibilities. Achievement, in very real terms (science, knowledge, technology) was anticipated, and social and individual improvement also seemed assured. The idea of progress in America, with origins in natural law, eighteenth century Enlightenment, and in Lockean philosophy, had both its conservative and radical proponents. Conservatives interpreted progress in terms of slow, unforced, inevitable change, while more radical reformers decided that progress would be effected much sooner with some prodding.[7] Conservatives saw that America's success had been achieved through traditional institutions in a natural, gradual way. Continued material and physical growth, they said, should proceed in this proven manner. One American historian notes that

> Established classes ... considered true progress to embrace a slow, gradual, and conservative advance without danger to the status quo. Against radical reformers eager for a social change, the conservatives argued that, since a certain degree of progress was inevitable, it should not be jeopardized by rash, revolutionary attempts to speed its course.[8]

For those who wanted perfection for America, for those who wanted social and moral betterment as well as tangible growth, progress could and should be actively pursued. The ideal perfectionist society would evince no poverty or deprived class, no criminals, no suffering, no slavery, no neglected citizen. Realization of the ideal meant immediate reform, and in the 1830's a "huge rescue operation" began.[9] Many reformers were motivated not only by the idea of progress and a belief that the millenium was within reach, but by a quest for moral reform as well.

Moral reformers were spurred into action by Charles Finney's Great Revival of the mid-1820's.[10] This period of evangelical activity was the last surge of the Second Great Awakening which had swept over America with varying intensity in the two generations after 1800. Finney, who had been raised in the burnt-over district of western New York (so called because the spirits of its inhabitants had been "fired" during revivals innumerable times), in 1824 began preaching a new doctrine -- and in an unorthodox way. To suit the more sedate urban class, Finney adopted an oratorical style that retained the emotionalism of the earlier frontier revivals, but refined its unrestrained leveling impulse. The substance of his preaching was as catching as the delivery. Finney held that God ruled the universe through a moral law which man could discover, provided that God gave him the power. God was willing to do this if man repented; and Finney offered revivals as the means to win God's grace. He preached the doctrine of "full salvation," declaring that all men could be saved by a personal conversion, a concept that was an anathema to "Old Light" orthodox Calvinists. Converts, Finney exhorted, could not then retreat from life to passively await the hereafter; they must begin a new life "in the interests of God's Kingdom."[11] Converts first had to believe, then apply their Christian attitudes to the improvement of society. Finney's interpretation of "disinterested benevolence," to secure the greatest happiness for the greatest number, encouraged converts to choose the most useful social roles possible, no matter what the personal sacrifice. Conversion, in short, was linked with evangelical activism.[12] Progress to Finney meant the working out of God's will, and since He was benevolent, the divine aim would entail the greatest possible happiness for man. As the number of converts increased, their subsequent benevolent activity would uplift the world. The reform impulse released by the Great Revival was an individualistic one, based on the assumption that personal moral reform was the mainspring of social advancement. Political and legal reform were not necessary, for if men were but converted, society would automatically improve. Social determinism was notably absent from this viewpoint, and Finney denied or ignored "the complexities of custom, prejudice, and sectional or class conflict that lie at the root of so much social injustice."[13] In their quest to reform, Finney also admonished his converts to "aim at being holy and not rest satisfied till [you] are as perfect as God."[14] This Christian perfectionism exerted a double-edged influence on later social reform. It was one source of a self-righteous moralism which in turn became the motivation and justification for social control of vices such as drinking. Christian perfectionism also accounted for the extremist positions adopted by radical factions of many social reform movements.[15] A more purely radical tenet in Finney's philosophy, and a forerunner of a significant abolitionist doctrine, concerned the idea of a higher law. Finney, according to one American historian, was the first to enunciate this concept when he preached that "no human legislation could set aside the law of God."[16] Among Finney's radical preachings, however, the most significant was his "New Light" doctrine of full salvation. Calvinism's grip on America was loosening. Men now had a positive, hopeful alternative to "the ages-old doctrine that

> In Adam's Fall,
> We sinned all."[17]

As motivations to reform, revivalism and the belief in progress were buttressed by other influences.[18] The romantic temper of the era nourished the idea that every man was important, no matter what his education, lineage, or wealth, "for however brutalized and degraded, every human being . . . possessed a spark of the divine."[19] Transcendentalism also encouraged reform, stressing the importance of personal regeneration as the requisite for any social movement; consequently, transcendentalists were extremely individualistic in their notions of reform, concentrating initially on "self-culture."[20] The individualism engrained in transcendentalism, frontier democracy, Finney's revivalism, and in Romanticism accounted in part for the tremendous variety of antebellum reforms.[21] Individualism was accentuated by the fact that many leaders of these earlier social movements were "youths" between the ages of twenty-four and thirty.[22] Because they were not yet fully committed to society, the young people who chose careers as reformers were avid critics of their milieu.

The young men at Lane Seminary, who abolitionized Ohio in the 1830's, were all Finney converts, or had been influenced by his doctrines. One American historian has pointed out that Finney's revivals "occasionally did save sinners . . . but their greatest execution was among earnest young people predisposed to morality and reform, who were sinners by courtesy only. Conversion involved a change of attitude for most of them, rather than a change in pattern of life."[23]

Antebellum reform, a nexus of societies and goals, was thus inspired by an equally complex set of interacting motivations.[24] To entangle the topic still further, most of the motivations to reform contained both radical and conservative potential. Romanticism, eighteenth-century revolutionary ideology, transcendentalism, the idea of progress, and evangelical Protestantism all exhibited this duality.[25] This makes static definitions of most reform terminology an impossibility. As well, the duality is indicative of both the ideological and tactical shifts that characterized nineteenth century reform, and of the various natures of those reforms. Temperance, for instance, remained a movement for social control throughout its history, a thrust that was conservative in the sense that temperance advocates wanted to "conserve" the old Puritan order. Other movements motivated by the same impulses were more radical, pragmatically searching for a more extreme, thorough social change. No matter what the essential nature of the reform -- radical or conservative -- almost every humanitarian movement was divided on the question of strategy. Abolition, temperance, labor and peace societies all split into radical or moderate factions, depending on both their final goal and on the way they wanted to induce change.[26]

ii

Abolition was one antebellum movement grounded in moral reform. Its roots also reached back to the eighteenth century Enlightenment, especially to the ideology of the Revolution, and it evinced humanitarian undertones as well. Abolitionists defined themselves in various ways between 1833-1861, but their common cause centered on ending chattel slavery and establishing an unprejudiced view of the Negro. Although dissention over tactics was rife, abolitionists were unanimous in agreeing that slavery was a national sin, a glaring inconsistency in a free, democratic land. Abolition began in the late 1820's primarily as a movement of moral suasion. In 1840 a clear split emerged between radical and moderate factions which were divided by the "woman question" and by the issue of political action to end slavery. Familiarity with the historical evolution of the movement is crucial in order to define various types of abolition and to understand ideological disputes. Ideologies were constantly in flux, inextricably tied both to changing historical conditions and to abolition's influential spokesmen.[27]

Abolition was not the first attempt by Americans to deal with the twin problems of slavery and freed black men. In pre-revolutionary America, only the Quakers kept arguments against slavery alive. In pamphlets demanding positive action against the peculiar institution, and in their personal lives, Quakers showed an intense opposition to slavery. Many who manumitted their own slaves did not seek financial compensation for their loss, but made efforts instead to repay freedmen for their past services.[28] This radical aspect of the Quakers' position, however, was unique until the emergence of immediatism in 1831. Prior to Garrison's call for immediate, uncompensated abolition (in the first issue of the Liberator, January 1, 1831), the most popular palliative for the ills of slavery was colonization of free Negroes in Africa. The antislavery sentiment that bolstered colonization was characterized by belief that slavery was an evil to be abolished at some indeterminate future point.[29] Despite the fact that between 1790-1800 slavery became entrenched in the upper South, where it had previously shown signs of weakening, national antislavery organization was nonexistent. Those who opposed slavery were satisfied with the progress of gradual emancipation of northern slaves, achieved by 1812. As well, "the albatross of the slave trade [such importation ended in 1808] was no longer strung around the national conscience."[30] Although nationwide emancipation had achieved partial success, there was no corresponding change, even in the North, in prejudicial attitudes and treatment.

The post-revolutionary period was particularly characterized by advocates of colonization, an effort which coalesced in 1816 with formation of the American Colonization Society (ACS).[31] Shortly after this national organization was formed, its adherents were harshly criticized for their racial prejudice, but "no one [had] denounced [earlier, unorganized] colonization as a proslavery instrument . . . for the very good reason that the project was supported only by men of genuine antislavery feeling."[32] Jefferson, in Notes on Virginia, heartily recommended "removal," and in 1788 James Madison endorsed a colonization plan in hopes of encouraging abolition. Madison and Jefferson, however, believed that free black men could never be accepted in white society because "the prejudice of the whites, prejudices which proceeding principally from the difference in colour must be considered as permanent and insuperable."[33] Early plans for colonization echoed this sentiment, which was intensified by genuine, widespread fear of free blacks. Colonization plans were taken most seriously after the Gabriel and Vesey insurrection plots were uncovered in 1800 and 1822, a fact symptomatic of the assumption that free Negroes, once acquainted with liberty and once educated, would arouse slaves to rebellion. Liberty would allow blacks to learn that freedom rightfully belonged to them, and as one early colonizationist expressed it, "The very nature of our government [is] the spirit we have to fear."[34]

The ACS proposed in 1816 to send manumitted slaves back to Africa.[35] Supported by such prominent national leaders as Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Andrew Jackson and John Marshall, many of whom owned slaves, the society received both federal funds and private contributions. Most popular in border states, where many were anxious to free slaves, but reluctant to have freedmen settle nearby, the ACS was nonetheless supported in all parts of the country. Many radical abolitionists of the 1830's were mere antislavery men in the 1820's, predisposed to gradual emancipation and reasoned arguments. Lewis Tappan, Gerrit Smith and James Birney, whose fortunes were later the mainstays of innumerable abolition societies and newspapers, all encouraged colonization in this period. Even the rabid Garrison, whose mentor in the 1820's was Benjamin Lundy, that decade's foremost gradualist, espoused colonization and gradualism. He announced in 1828 that "We shall pursue . . . the gradual emancipation of every slave in the republic. . . ."[36] It soon became clear to many, however, that true antislavery sentiment was distorted by the ACS, whose preoccupation with ridding America of free blacks exposed an underlying racial prejudice. Colonizationists showed little concern for the enslaved, whom they considered well suited to their position because of inherent racial inferiority. Their attention was focused instead on removing the dreaded freedman to his ancestral home. The editor of the New York Courier directed this comment to the newly formed ACS:

> Why was not something proposed for the enslaved blacks? Why not send them to Africa? That indeed would look a little like humanity and disinterestedness. But the free blacks are a dangerous mixture with the enslaved blacks. Aye -- there's the rub -- and there the occasion of all this unexpected, insubstantial tenderness and humanity towards them.[37]

Colonizationists asserted that they were moved to action by a concern for Negroes, but the underpinnings of fear and prejudice were obvious. Leaders of Philadelphia's black community, who had once looked to repatriation in Africa as a chance for liberty and a new life, reversed their position in 1817, stressing instead the need to abolish slavery and improve the Negro's life in America. Likewise, the average freedman was not persuaded that a trip back across the Atlantic would improve his lot. James Forten, the Philadelphia Negro who was instrumental in turning Garrison against colonization, recounted the reaction of a black congregation in 1817 to the program of colonization:

"We had a large meeting of Males at the /Reverend Richard Allen's/ Church the other evening. Three thousand at least attended, and there was not one sole /sic./ that was in favor of going to Africa. They think that the slave holders want to get rid of them so as to make their property more secure."[38] But the most stinging denunciation of the colonization movement came from the converted Garrison, who in his 1832 Thoughts on African Colonization, told those "promulgators of unrighteousness, /that/ with the Declaration of Independence in one hand, and the Bible in the other, /he would/ fearlessly give battle. . . ."[39] He condemned the ACS as anti-Christian and anti-republican, suggesting on one occasion that if Negroes were to be shipped back to Africa, perhaps the colonizationists should repatriate themselves to Great Britain.[40] He recognized that colonizationists chose to eliminate the object of their prejudice instead of dealing with their own attitudes and beliefs. To Garrison, one American historian notes, "the only way to abolish slavery was to do it before proceeding to the task of elevating the race; . . . that only as a free man enjoying a full measure of civil rights could the Negro cultivate his mind, accumulate property, discipline his habits, and assume responsibilities so essential to correct social attitudes."[41] Garrison assumed that Negroes were Americans, entitled to remain in the United States and to enjoy the same liberty and opportunities accorded to whites. Colonizationists, to the contrary,

> can love and benefit /Negroes/ four thousand miles off, but not at home. They profess to be ... actuated by the most philanthropic motives; and yet are cherishing the most unmanly and unchristian prejudices. They tell us that we must always be hostile to the people of color, while

> they remain in this country. If this be so, then we had better burn our bibles, and our Declaration of Independence, and candidly acknowledge ourselves to be incorrigible tyrants and heathens.[42]

Garrison's criticism of colonization was crucial to his definition of immediate emancipation, for that "pernicious doctrine" was almost the complete opposite of what soon became his life-long cause. When the Liberator was four months into publication, Garrison editorialized on the motivations of the ACS:

> I am prepared to show, that those who have entered into this CONSPIRACY AGAINST HUMAN RIGHTS are unanimous in abusing their victims; ... unanimous in proclaiming the absurdidty, that our free blacks are natives of Africa; unanimous in propagating the libel, that they cannot be elevated and improved in this country; unanimous in opposing their instruction; unanimous in exciting the prejudices of the people against them; unanimous in apologizing for the crime of slavery; ... unanimous in their true motive for the measure -- a terror lest the blacks should rise to avenge their accumulated wrongs. It is a conspiracy to send the free people of color to Africa under a benevolent pretense, but really that the slaves should be held more securely in bondage. It is a conspiracy based upon fear, oppression and falsehood, which draws its ailment from the prejudices of the people, which is sustained by duplicity, which really upholds the slave system,... which no precept of the bible can justify, ... which should be annihilated at a blow.[43]

Garrison's conversion to immediatism had important consequences for the abolition movement. His switch in attitude coincided with the peak of Finney's revivals, the preliminary organization of a national, militant antislavery society by Lewis Tappan, the winning of Theodore Weld to the cause, and the reorganization of the British Anti-Slavery Society along immediatist lines.[44] Immediatism was adopted in the early thirties for two reasons. Evangelicalism imparted the idea that slavery was a sin, and like any other transgression it must be immediately repented, with amends made. Underscoring the moralism was a pent-up frustration with gradualism. Half-measures and reasoned arguments, primarily because they required no revision of prejudicial attitudes, had not worked.[45] Immediatism retained earlier arguments that slavery was inhumane and inconsistent with American political philosophy, but emphasized the proclamation that slavery was a sin. This new doctrine was also an appeal to the Christian conscience[46] expressed publicly in an emotional, moralistic, vituperative rhetoric. Garrison, for instance, in the first issue of the Liberator, announced that:

> I shall strenuously contend for the immediate enfranchisement of our slave population.... I seize this opportunity to make a full and unequivocal recantation of my former assent to the popular but pernicious doctrine of gradual abolition.
>
> I am aware that many object to the severity of my language; but is there not cause for severity? I *will* be as harsh as truth, as uncompromising as justice. On this subject I do not wish to think, or speak, or write, with moderation. No! No! Tell a man whose house is on fire to give moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the arms of a ravisher . . . but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present. I am in earnest -- I will not equivocate -- I will not excuse -- I will not retreat a single inch -- AND I WILL BE HEARD.

He defined "immediate emancipation to consist in the annihilation of *property in man* . . . ; [to be followed by] employing them as free laborers, and giving them their wives and children, and equitable wages; and in placing them under the control and protection of righteous laws. . . ."[47] Theodore Weld, sometimes categorized as a "responsible" abolitionist in contrast to Garrison's "reckless" proclivities, could be equally virulent.[48] The rhetoric was undeniably strident and indignant, prompting an answering "pro-slavery" doctrine from the South and encouraging polarization of the two sections. Yet adoption of this rhetoric was an intellectual response to the problem of ending slavery as well as a religiously-inspired reaction to slavery's immorality. Abolitionists made a conscious, ideological choice to discard the expedient, gradualistic solutions of the past in favor of a new tactic: immediatism. Abolitionists reasoned that defining specific goals and presenting detailed emancipation programs to the public simply would not work. If the public could be persuaded of the moral urgency to end slavery immediately, government would be forced to deal with the practicalities. For most antebellum reformers, changing public opinion meant that they must "Agitate! Agitate! Agitate!"[49] The best way to draw attention to immediate abolition, the quickest way to educate the masses, was with extreme language, the tried-and-true method of evangelists and temperance advocates. This is Garrison's explanation for his switch (the earliest) to radical tactics:

> In demanding equal and exact justice we may get partial redress; in asking for the whole that is due us we may get a part; in advocating the immediate, we may succeed in procuring the speedy abolition of slavery. But if we demand anything short of justice we shall recover no damages; if we ask for a part we shall get nothing.[50]

When Garrison first announced that gradualism must be rejected for immediate abolition, he was regarded as unreasonable, fanatical, or, in the slang of the day, ultraistic. By the time the American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS) became active in 1833, however, many of Garrison's ex-colleagues became converts to his cause.[51]

Instructions from the AASS to one of its field agents for the year 1834 contain in a calm, declarative form uncharacteristic of its individual members, the aims and tactics of immediate abolition:

> Our object is, the overthrow of American slavery.... We expect to accomplish this, mainly by showing to the public ... its contrariety to the first principles of religion, morals, and humanity.... In this way, by the force of truth, we expect to correct the common errors that prevail respecting slavery, and to produce a just public sentiment....
>
> You will inculcate every where, the great fundamental principle of IMMEDIATE ABOLITION, as the duty of all masters, on the ground that slavery is both unjust and unprofitable. Insist principally on the SIN OF SLAVERY, because our main hope is in the consciences of men....
>
> We reprobate the idea of compensation to slave holders, because it implies the right of slavery.... We also reprobate all plans of expatriation, by whatever specious pretenses covered, as a remedy for slavery, for they all proceed from prejudice against color....
>
> The people of color ought at once to be emancipated and recognized as citizens, and their rights secured as such, equal in all respects to others, according to the cardinal principle laid down in the American Declaration of Independence....
>
> Do not allow yourself to be drawn away from the main object, to exhibit a detailed PLAN of abolition; for men's consciences will be greatly relieved from the feeling of present duty, by any objections or difficulties which they can find or fancy in your plan. Let the principle be decided on, of immediate abolition, and the plans will easily present themselves....[52]

Immediate abolition was thus both a tactic and a goal. As a radical doctrine it was defined in relation to the status quo of colonization and gradualism, rejecting the idea that a socio-economic change as monumental as abolition could be achieved by conservative or moderate methods. The prejudice inherent in colonization schemes was theoretically abandoned, although prejudice remained engrained in some abolitionists.[53] Earliest statements of abolition recognized that a change in attitudes towards the black man was necessary. "Prejudice is to be crucified," said Garrison. Abolitionists argued that racial inferiority was not a function of biology, but a function of slavery. Free the slave, treat him like a man, "educate and equalize" him, and all reasons for prejudice, except color, would be eliminated.[54] Unlike colonizationists, militant abolitionists proposed to meet the problems of emancipation and freedmen honestly, directly, and without delay. An abolitionist, therefore, was one who believed in the twin doctrines of immediate emancipation without compensation or expatriation, with a concomitant change in attitudes toward the Negro. Radical abolitionists remained true to these principles through the Civil War, and in the antebellum years advocated extreme measures and rhetoric in order to achieve their goals. Moderate abolitionists of the 1830's also believed in immediatism and equality, but preferred to conciliate the public outcry over immediatism by defining their doctrine as "immediate abolition gradually achieved." Slavery need not be ended instantly, they explained, but the first steps toward abolition were to begin without delay. Unlike the radicals, they chose moderation as a tactic: they didn't intentionally inflame public opinion with "incendiary" statements. Moderate and radical positions were continuously redefined in the 1830's until more identifiable ideologies of abolition crystallized in the next decade.

In the 1830's the tactics of organized abolition were tied as strongly to historical circumstances as they were to the developing ideologies. The first society to organize along immediatist lines had been Garrison's New England Anti-Slavery Society (later the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society), formed in Boston in 1832. The twelve charter members, most of whom were evangelical Christians, were dedicated to immediate abolition without compensation or colonization. The following year the national organization (AASS) was formed in New York City, with a Declaration of Sentiments drafted by Garrison.

> The object of this Society is the entire abolition of slavery in the United States.... This Society shall aim to elevate the character and condition of the people of color, by encouraging their intellectual, moral, and religious improvement, and by removing public prejudice, that thus they may, according to their intellectual and moral worth, share an equality with the whites, of civil and religious privileges....[55]

Goals were immediate abolition and equality for freedmen; tactics were diversified. One of their most persistent efforts concerned winning over the rich and influential interdenominational benevolent societies, which initially refused to ally themselves with the AASS for fear of alienating their southern chapters. The AASS eventually won over the American Home Missionary Society, the Boston branch of the American Tract Society, but failed to capture the American Bible Society.[56]

The grass-roots movement for abolition was directed by the national society through its field agents. Instructions to Theodore Weld, contained in his 1834 commission as an AASS agent in Ohio, directed him to be factual in his lectures, "to use only facts that are well authenticated," to visit the state's most prominent cities first, calling immediately on local ministers ("the hinges of community") and on others sympathetic to the cause, and then to secure a church from which to lecture. Auxiliary societies were to be formed, no matter how small, for the purpose of raising funds and circulating free abolitionist literature. Policy dictated that no funds were to be solicited at the lectures. "Let this be stated in the public notice of the meeting," Weld was told.[57] Auxiliaries were encouraged to "hold public meetings" every Fourth of July as an occasion for speech-making and fund-raising.[58]

Weld, "the most mobbed man in the United States," hardly needed instructions on proselytizing.[59] In 1831 he had toured the old Northwest to promote the concept of education through manual labor and, at the behest of Arthur Tappan, to find a site for a national theological seminary on the "Manual Labor Plan." During his search for what soon became the famous Lane Seminary, Weld also managed to convert many to abolitionism, notably Alabaman James Birney, who freed his slaves, moved north, and later ran for President on the Liberty ticket. Lane Seminary, headed by colonizationist and "Old Light" Presbyterian Lyman Beecher, was conceived by Arthur Tappan as a training center for the young men evangelized in recent years by Finney. The students had barely begun their formal theological pursuits when Weld, fulfilling a promise to Tappan, organized a debate on slavery in the winter of 1832-33. Except for a few avowed colonizationists, all students participated in the eighteen evenings of discussion. Organization of the debate paralleled that of Finney's "protracted" revival sessions, a method Weld learned during his apprenticeship to the preacher. Two topics were examined, each for nine evenings. Opinion was nearly unanimous that slavery should be immediately abolished in the South. Virtually all students, including several whose parents were slaveholders, finally agreed that "the doctrines, tendencies, and measures of the American Colonization Society," did not "render it worthy of the patronage of the Christian public."[60] Imbued with Finney's philosophy that "faith without works is dead," the seminarians formed an abolition society on the final evening of the debate.[61] The events at Lane received coverage in several newspapers, contributing to the decline of colonization, and reinforcing the religious, evangelical motivation to abolish slavery.[62] The dramatic character of the debate was heightened by the faculty's subsequent passage of stringent resolutions to suppress all anti-slavery agitation at Lane. The students, almost to a man, withdrew to nearby Oberlin to continue studies and teach in the schools they had organized for Cincinnati's free blacks. "It is of immense importance," said Weld, "that the public should see what blacks can do." He described this endeavor to Lewis Tappan.

> We have formed a large and efficient organization for elevating the colored people in Cincinnati -- have established a Lyceum among them, and lecture three or four evenings a week.... Besides this, an evening free school, for teaching them to read, is in operation every week day evening; and we are about establishing one or two more. We are also getting up a library for circulation among those who can read, and are about establishing a reading room. In addition to this, two of our students ... commenced a school among the blacks in the city. ... The first went down and opened a school, and it was filled the first day, and that mainly with adults.... Both [schools] are now incessantly occupied.[63]

Sunday schools~~,~~ schools for women, and house visitations were also part of Weld's program. Some of the Lane rebels made this kind of benevolent activity their life's work; others, like Weld, continued to abolitionize the West.[64]

Denial of academic freedom at Lane was the harbinger of similar repression. The 1830's were marked by mob violence against abolitionists, and by state and federal opposition to the AASS pamphlet and petition campaigns. Both the physical violence and the state-sanctioned denial of free press and speech persuaded many citizens that the abolition movement had to be supported in order to defend the basic, natural rights of Americans. As Birney wrote to philanthropist-abolitionist Gerrit Smith,

> It is as much as all the patriotism in our country can do, to keep alive the spirit of liberty in the free states. The contest is becoming -- has become -- one, not alone of freedom for the black, but of freedom for the white. It has now become absolutely necessary, that slavery should cease in order that freedom may be preserved to any portion of our land. The antagonistic principles of liberty and slavery have been roused into action and one or the other must be victorious. There will be no cessation of the strife until slavery shall be exterminated or liberty destroyed.[65]

Birney's attempt to publish an antislavery paper in his hometown had been stopped by neighbors, who asked Birney to postpone publication plans until they could secure legal injunction. They threatened violent action if he did not comply. Henry B. Stanton, a Lane rebel (later the husband of Elizabeth Cady), was mobbed one hundred fifty times before 1840; in fact, there was hardly a lecturer who didn't escape brickbats and rotten eggs. Buildings were sabotaged, windows broken, meetings interrupted, audiences dispersed. George Thompson, a British abolitionist, had his life threatened twice and Garrison, Thompson's American host, was dragged through Boston's streets before finding refuge in the city jail. An anti-abolitionist poster announcing Thompson's Boston visit enticed its readers with this: "A purse of $100 has been raised by a number of patriotic citizens to reward the individual who shall first lay violent hands on Thompson, so that he may be brought to the tar kettle before dusk. Friends of the Union be vigilant!"[66] The most tragic incident was the murder of gradualist Elijah Lovejoy, who was killed by an Illinois mob while defending his antislavery press. Lovejoy's martyrdom crystallized a "free speech" movement, and Wendell Phillips and Gerrit Smith, among innumerable others, were converted to abolition because of Lovejoy's murder and the emerging civil rights issue.[67]

Constitutional rights were abridged not only by amorphous mobs, but by specific government action as well. In 1836 the AASS began flooding the South with abolitionist literature. This pamphlet campaign was purposely directed not to free Negroes, but to white Southerners, especially the clergy. In July, 1836, Charleston citizens ceremoniously burned the "incendiary literature" that had accumulated in their post offices. The incident was widely imitated throughout the South. Supported by the federal Postmaster General and by President Jackson, southern postmasters continued to destroy the abolitionist bundles. The New York postmaster followed suit, announcing that "out of regard for Southern feeling," abolitionist literature could no longer be forwarded.[68]

This episode was compounded by Congressional action to stop the flood of abolitionist petitions that peaked in 1836. Since 1790 those opposed to slavery had petitioned Congress to abolish the peculiar institution in the District of Columbia, and in 1836 an organized campaign inundated Congress with such petitions.[69] A "gag rule" was passed (made a standing rule in 1840), instructing that all petitions be automatically tabled. John Quincy Adams and Joshua Giddings championed both antislavery and the right to freedom of speech in the House of Representatives, and aided by an antislavery lobby directed by Weld, the gag rule was finally voted down in 1845.[70] These violations of the Bill of Rights convinced many that abolitionism had to be identified with a battle for basic American principles. "Many Americans who did not feel strongly about slavery," notes one American historian, "began to believe that if abolitionists could be mobbed with impunity and prevented from having their petitions considered by Congress, the rights of all Americans were in danger."[71] The civil rights issue thus had two effects. Abolition began to gain acceptance, but popularization of the movement drew supporters who diluted the movement's original aims.

Effects of the civil rights issue were not the only changes in the abolitionist movement in the 1830's. Between 1835 and 1840, radical and moderate positions on abolition coalesced, culminating in the 1840 division of the AASS. Moderate abolitionists, led by the Tappans and Birney, seceded to form the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (A & F), while the remaining members of the AASS elected Garrison as their president. The 1840 split was precipitated by divergent opinions on the role of women within the Society, and by the question of political action. The A & F was particularly intent on pursuing a political solution to slavery. The two surface issues of political abolition and the active membership of women, however, were symptomatic of an underlying difference in ideology and tactics.

The radical faction remained convinced that moral suasion was the only proper means to convert Americans to immediate abolition. Abolition was thought to be a moral question which could never be dealt with by an inherently conservative institution. Government was an unconverted sinner, an institution based on high ideals, but corrupted by its constitutional commitment to protect slavery. Its vested interest was maintenance of the established order, with any change effected by means of compromise and expediency. Radicals were sure that a quick, comprehensive, permanent end to slavery could not be won in Washington.

Radicals looked to Garrison as their leader, despite the fact that many did not embrace his philosophy of total reform. Immediatism, with its emphasis on slavery as sin, remained a key tenet of Garrison's, but by 1835, his espousal of Christian perfectionism impelled him to support the radical, extremist wings of several other causes. He was, for instance, one of the American Peace Society's radicals, a non-resistant who eschewed violence in any circumstance. Human government, he thought, was anti-Christian, based on power and violence. This anti-government stance was intensified by his belief that the Constitution was a pro-slavery document which recognized and sanctioned slavery. As a result, he neither voted in any election nor supported the new, moderate trend of political abolition.

Garrison's perfectionism also moved him to advocate human rights. In 1838 he changed the masthead of the Liberator to read "Universal Emancipation," a motto which to him included women.[72] Most radicals agreed with Garrison's support of equal participation of women in AASS meetings, a point bitterly contested by the moderates. Garrison also consistently championed the right of women to lecture and to act as voting delegates to international conventions. As well, his broad defence of free speech accounts for his editorial policy of including in the Liberator opposing views on a variety of reforms. Like other radical abolitionists, Garrison viewed slavery as just one evil in a social system that was basically corrupt. His intense application of perfectionism, however, was unique among abolitionists. The radicals who remained in the AASS after 1840 are often referred to as "Garrisonians" by modern historians. This classification connotes their agreement with Garrison only on the issues of equality for women in the AASS and opposition to political abolition. Garrisonians did not necessarily agree with their leader's other opinions. The anomalous Garrison saw himself as the era's ultimate champion of human rights, refusing to compromise his involvement in any worthwhile cause by setting inflexible priorities.

Many of Garrison's colleagues in the AASS viewed slavery and reform quite differently, regarding his extremism as a detriment to the success of abolition. The ideology of the moderate group, which formed the core of political abolition in the 1840's and 1850's, also crystallized at mid-decade. Like their radical colleagues, moderates felt that slavery was one national sin among many; but not only were they amenable to political solutions, they also insisted that because slavery was the greatest, most conspicuous sin, abolition must take precedence over other reforms.[73] Moderates were also influenced by the growing popular acceptance of abolition. The support generated by the free speech issue, although less ardent and extreme than the original abolitionist impulse, was later reinforced by passage of the 1850 Fugitive Slave Law. The civil rights issue had shown that the questions of abolition and slavery could threaten America's most cherished freedoms. The Fugitive Slave Act, which put the onus on any dark-complexioned free person to prove his status, underscored the notion that abolition affected not only the slave in the South, but the free man in the North.[74]

In short, the reasons for supporting abolition were changing. Slavery was still seen as a sin by moderate abolitionists, but they were eager to take political advantage of this new popular support in order to effect emancipation. The moderates were, in the main, the abolitionists of the 1830's who had conciliated public opinion on the issue of immediatism, and by 1840 this tendency to compromise was channeled into the movement for political abolition. As they became increasingly tempted by a wider political base, the original goals of immediatism and equality were compromised by more expedient measures acceptable to the voting public. This dilution of abolitionist doctrine was not achieved with formation of the Liberty Party in 1839, but took nearly two decades to complete. Radical abolitionists, however, remained true to the original aims and uncompromising tactics, including the harsh rhetoric. The Garrisonian abolitionists were radicals who supported the assumption that a national abolition society should not exclude members because of extremist positions that alienated the average American.

Historians do not agree on which faction forced the vote that split the AASS.[75] Garrison, who believed that the moderates were plotting to purge the radical faction, himself packed the house, and nominated a woman for an executive position -- the move which occasioned the Society's split. When the moderates lost the vote, they walked out en masse and immediately formed the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

Although they did not support all the perfectionist beliefs of their president, the Garrisonians who remained in the AASS "opposed efforts to have the AASS officially endorse any faction's religious or political principles and disavow others."[76] The A & F, on the other hand, was careful to control its public image by excluding those with ultraistic leanings, but neither organization attracted many new members. The A & F, however, was instrumental in forming the Liberty Party, the new symbol of abolition. Created to convince the North that slavery was of paramount importance, it ran Birney for President in 1840 and 1844. Birney's "one-idealism" (hostility to slavery), was overwhelmed by the emerging Free Soil coalition of northern anti-slaveryites. Historian Aileen Kraditor has cast the history of political abolition in terms of expediency over principle. In order to attract political support, Free Soil not only substituted non-extension for immediate abolition, but sacrificed the abolitionist doctrine of equality. Kraditor suggests that in Free Soil, Libertymen thus rejected orthodox abolition:

> When the Libertymen in the Free Soil party played down the equal-rights issue, to gain wide support among a racist constituency, they were separating what had always been linked in the antislavery society constitutions and

> abolitionist propaganda: abolition of slavery and conversion of the white man to the acceptance of the Negro as his brother. In fact, the abolitionists' denial that their agitation would lead to bloodshed had always been based on the insistence that abolition would result from that conversion. A large segment of the abolitionist movement was now tacitly giving up this traditional assumption and substituting for it the thesis that abolition could be effected by political means alone.[77]

Formation of the Liberty Party in 1839 was one indication of a general shift in political alliances. The existing national parties, Whig and Democrat, which both cut across sectional lines, did not express the growing polarization over the issues of abolition and "non-extension" of slavery in the territories.[78] Antislavery factions in both national parties eventually joined with a majority of Libertymen in the Free Soil coalition, and later in the Republican Party. Although some Libertymen fought to retain their party's original aims, the question of abolition, once injected into the traditional political structure, was molded to suit the opinions of the voting public. The influential moderate abolitionists thus diverted into politics the original abolitionist aim of ending slavery through moral suasion. Appeal to the conscience was superseded by political action, with its implied threat of coercion.

Orthodox apolitical abolition, however, did not disappear. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and others in the AASS continued to press for the original abolitionist goals by radical means. Through their newspapers and national Society, and on the lecture circuit, they urged that the sinfulness of slavery warranted immediate emancipation, and they fought against the prevailing popular belief that the Negro was innately inferior to the white man.[79]

iii

The entire abolition movement of the 1830's, when viewed in its historical context, was radical. Even the less virulent moderate abolitionists shocked the average American with their ideas, goals, rhetoric, and dedication. The political faction of the 1840's eventually forfeited its radicalism partly because its members compromised their original aims, and partly because the status quo increasingly reflected acceptance of antislavery and the need to do something about emancipation. Most of the A & F members who formed the Liberty Party, however, did not fully realize what effect politics would have on their goals. In a way, the radical faction was more politically astute, for although radicals felt encouraged by the growing antislavery sentiment, they understood that such an extreme reform could not be peacefully realized in the political arena.

NOTES: CHAPTER I

[1] Quoted in Bertram Wyatt-Brown, Lewis Tappan and the Evangelical War Against Slavery (New York, 1971), p. 22.

[2] Ralph Waldo Emerson, "New England Reformers," p. 366. Emerson added that, "With this din of opinion and debate there was a keener scrutiny of institutions and domestic life than any we had known; there was sincere protesting against existing evils, and there were changes of employment dictated by conscience."

[3] Some of the texts and monographs which discuss the varied nature of social movements are Tyler, Freedom's Ferment; J. C. Furnas, The Americans: A Social History of the United States, 1587-1914 (New York, 1969); and Edwin C. Rozwenc, The Making of American Society, 2 vols. (Boston, 1972), vol. 1. See Gibert Seldes, The Stammering Century (New York, 1928) for the peripheral movements as well as Branch, Sentimental Years, chap. 9, from which the list of "faddish reforms" is drawn, pp. 261-262. Branch has documented the existence of 90 charities, 22 asylums, 8 hospitals, 7 dispensaries, and 75 fraternal societies with 350 chapters among New York City's benevolent associations of 1853.

[4] The major exceptions here are the religious utopias and some social utopias which, although certainly concerned with improving the human condition, did not describe their own efforts as humanitarian. Advocates of most other types of reform did define themselves in this manner. In the strictest definition, however, "humanitarian" applies to charitable reforms such as poor relief, or to reforms motivated by compassion such as those associated with the blind, deaf, dumb, insane, and retarded.

[5] Albert Brisbane, "The Question of Slavery," in the Harbinger, June 21, 1845.

[6] Riegel, Young America, p. 5. Also see pp. 1-31 for discussion of America's feeling of superiority over Europe. Finney and the "New Light" Protestants spoke of democracy as the government most approved by God. See William G. McLoughlin, "Charles Grandison Finney," in Davis, Ante-Bellum Reform, p. 101. Thomas, in "Romantic Reform," p. 659 points out that progress, to the Enlightenment generation, had conservative aspects. Progress was planned, slow, and mechanical, as evinced in the Constitution's system of checks and balances. For a similar and more detailed interpretation see Davis, Ante-Bellum Reform, p. 6. Ekirch, The Idea of Progress, notes that while in Europe, where progress was a philosophical idea, in America it was a dynamic reality, p. 37. The discussion of progress which follows is indebted to Ekirch, especially pp. 1-37, Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, chap. 1, and Riegel, chap. 1.

[7] Ekirch, The Idea of Progress, pp. 36-37, says that "In contrast to a violent or revolutionary change, progress was considered to involve a regular and gradual process of growth. The concept of intellectual and moral improvement was used to distinguish the idea from those mere material and physical advances which might involve a change without true individual and social betterment. . . . The idea of progress was sufficiently vague in its meaning . . . to be susceptible of use in justifying even contradictory tendencies," especially radical and conservative.

[8] Ibid., p. 193.

[9] Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 662.

[10] On Finney and the Great Revival see, Winthrop S. Hudson, Religion in America, 2d ed. (New York, 1973), chap. 6; William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York, 1930), pp. 281-284; Gilbert Barnes, The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844 (New York, 1933); McLoughlin, "Charles Finney," in Davis, Ante-Bellum Reform; and Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists.

[11] Finney, quoted in Barnes, Antislavery Impulse, p. 11.

[12] McLoughlin, "Charles Finney," in Davis, Ante-Bellum Reform, p. 102. Also see Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, pp. 204-205. One of Finney's converts was Theodore Weld, whose influence on the abolition movement easily equalled that of Garrison and Phillips. For an account of Finney's own conversion, see Hudson, Religion in America, pp. 142-143.

[13] Ibid., p. 103.

[14] Quoted in ibid., p. 105. The relevant Biblical injunction was "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

[15] Garrison, for one, attributed many of his radical stands to the doctrine of perfectionism. Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 660, suggests that "Perfectionism radically altered the moral reform movement by shattering the benevolent societies themselves." Abolition, temperance and peace movements all split between moderates who were "content to preach," and radicals who wanted total abstinence, peace, or abolition. It should be noted that Finney was opposed to the perfectionist theories of John Humphrey Noyes. He was aghast at the complex marriage practised at Oneida, believing, to the contrary, that Christians became more perfect with the practice of self-denial, not self-indulgence. The two men did agree that man was ultimately perfectible.

[16] Finney, quoted in Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, p. 209.

[17] Krout and Fox, Completion of Independence, p. 265. For discussion of the doctrinal disputes between New and Old Lights, see Barnes, Antislavery Impulse, chap. 1.

[18] Lois Banner, "Religion and Reform in the Early Republic: The Role of Youth," Am. Q. 23 (1971): 677-678, including all footnotes, is an excellent summary of both motivations to reform and of recent scholarship concerned with those motivations. Merle Curti, The Growth of American Thought (New York, 1943), pp. 369-382 also discusses the roots of reform.

[19] Curti, Growth of American Thought, p. 372. Curti remarks that Romanticism also encouraged conservative views, for instance the Romantic view of woman, pp. 375-76. Emotional aspects of Romanticism, which were a reaction to the reason of the Enlightenment, also led to sentimentalism in some humanitarian reforms. Jordan, White Man's Burden, pp. 143-144, suggests both positive and negative aspects of this trend in relation to the abolition movement.

[20] For information on the transcendentalists, especially the more socially radical segment, see intro., above, p. 13. Thomas, "Romantic Reform," reiterates the Emersonian transcendentalists' preoccupation with the problem of "implementing their ideas of self-culture without corrupting them with the false values of materialism," p. 672. Emerson's emphasis, before 1850, was on self-realization; during the 1850's he became more involved with reform movements, eventually supporting John Brown.

[21] Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, pp. 2-3, makes a similar connection.

[22] Banner, "Religion and Reform in the Early Republic," believes that a "significant group" of reformers was young. She investigates the "generational perspective" to discover more about their motives and reform impulses, p. 678. Youths are defined more by their societal role than by chronological age, and their attributes of vigor, optimism, idealism, emotionalism, commitment, and sense of mission are emphasized, pp. 678-82. Her concentration is on the Lane students' rejection of liberal solutions in favor of radicalism, p. 695. Wyatt-Brown, in "Elkins' Antislavery Interpretation Reexamined," p. 163, discusses the ways in which youthful reformers fit into Elkins' anti-institutional thesis. For a sociological interpretation of the idea of youth, see Kenneth Keniston, "Youth: A 'New' Stage of Life," Am. Sch. 39 (autumn 1970): 631-654. Emerson, in his essay "The Conservative," noted that, "The youth, of course, is an innovator by the fact of his birth." See his Complete Works, 11 vols., Riverside ed. (London, 1883-1887), 1: 289.

[23] Barnes, Antislavery Impulse, p. 25. Lane Seminary is discussed in more detail on pp. 44-46, below.

[24] Other motivations not discussed here include utilitarianism (See Curti, *Growth of American Thought*, p. 374), and the thesis that abolitionists and other similarly committed radicals were psychologically maladjusted (see Elkins' *Slavery* or Craven's *Coming of the Civil War*, passim). The best refutation of this rash theory is Martin Duberman, "The Abolitionists and Psychology," *JNH* 47 (1962): 183-191. Another theory not directly dealt with in this study is the idea that reform was sparked by a status rebellion led by the old commercial and ministerial New England classes in order to reclaim their former dominance, or to inculcate traditional religious values. See Banner, "Reform in the Early Republic," p. 677, Curti, *Growth of American Thought*, p. 367, Fredrickson, *Inner Civil War*, 31-35. Of the numerous historians who disagree with the status rebellion theory, Gerald Sorin, in *The New York Abolitionists: A Case Study of Political Radicalism* (Westport, Conn., 1971), gives a thorough but concise rebuttal. See especially the introduction, chap. 1 and chap. 4. In these same chapters, Sorin refutes the proposal that abolitionist activism was irresponsible and immature.

[25] Americans have continued to use one idea or concept to justify opposing aims or actions. For instance, those who supported the war in Vietnam did so in order to perpetuate the principles of American democracy, especially the right to government by self-determination. Those who opposed the war justified their belief for the same reason.

[26] Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 658, believes that revival-inspired reform was moral, not social. He notes, however, that "moral reformers inherited a theological revolution [the doctrine of full salvation and the belief that all men were perfectible] which in undermining their conservative defenses completely reversed their expectations for a Christian America. The transformation of American theology . . . released the very forces of romantic perfectionism that conservatives most feared."

[27] In antebellum reform history, to separate ideologies from individuals would be misleading. Ideologies were not static, and rarely achieved a status separate from a particular spokesman or group. In the abolition movement, four of the most outstanding leaders were William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Theodore Weld, and James G. Birney. Weld, Finney's most valuable assistant, compiled one of the most widely-read abolitionists tracts in 1836 (with help from his wife and sister-in-law) -- *Slavery As It Is*. His other activities are detailed below, pp. 44-46. Weld's reputation has been clouded by his abhorence of publicity: he refused all but one invitation to speak at national conventions and would not allow his speeches to be reprinted in newspapers. Birney, one of Weld's converts and the spearhead of political abolition, left a prosperous law business in Alabama when he freed his slaves and moved north in the 1830's. Phillips was one of the movement's most intellectual and persistently radical members, and headed the AASS after Garrison resigned in 1863.

Phillips and Weld were the era's two reform speakers most highly acclaimed for their eloquence, logic, and ability to move an audience. Garrison, because of his unique radicalism and his very public, indignant rhetoric, has too often overshadowed other abolitionist leaders. However, he was undeniably a driving force behind immediatism and radical abolition until 1863.

[28] Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, pp. 464-465 and Davis, "Emergence of Immediatism," p. 212.

[29] Jordan, *White Man's Burden*, p. 136. In this thesis the term abolitionist defines someone who supported both immediate emancipation and an end to prejudice. The term antislavery refers to a person who opposed the existence of slavery. Some antislaveryites expressed sincere hatred of slavery but were simply not prepared to take a more radical position. Many antislavery groups, however, opposed slavery for racist reasons. There were white antislavery westerners, for instance, who were against the extension of slavery into the territories because they wanted their section to remain white.

[30] Ibid., p. 130.

[31] The proper name of the ACS in the American Society for the Colonization of the Free People of Color in the United States. See Dumond, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War*, p. 10.

[32] Jordan, *White Man's Burden*, p. 207.

[33] Ibid. For details of the Fairfax and Tucker colonization plans, see ibid., pp. 208ff. Fear of free Negroes is copiously documented both in Jordan, pp. 210-211; in Clement Eaton, *The Freeom-of-Thought Struggle in the Old South*, rev. ed. (New York, 1940), chap. 4; and William Lloyd Garrison, *Thoughts on African Colonization* ([Boston, 1832]; reprint ed., New York, 1968), chaps. 6, 8, and 9.

[34] Quoted in Jordan, *White Man's Burden*, p. 211.

[35] Liberia was the usual destination. For information on colonization, see the ACS' organ, *African Repository*; Garrison, *Thoughts on African Colonization*; Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, pp. 476-481 (Tyler portrays an unusually rosy picture of colonization); and Dumond, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War*, pp. 12-20.

[36] Quoted from *Genius of Universal Emancipation* in Alice Adams, *The Neglected Period of Anti-Slavery in America, 1808-1831* (Gloucester, Mass., 1964), p. 67.

[37] Garrison, *Thoughts on African Colonization*, p. vi.

[38] Ibid., p. ix. Forten felt that "colonization did nothing but divert American Negroes from the struggle for a better life in

America and keep whites from facing their responsibilities to all citizens regardless of race or color," pp. x-xi. Benjamin Quarles, in Black Abolitionists (London, 1969), pp. 3-4, reconstructs the 1817 meeting which convened to discuss colonization. Quarles, who concentrates on the contributions of Negroes to the abolition movement, deals with the reaction of blacks to colonization (and the subsequent switch to immediatism) in chap. 1.

[39] Ibid., p. 14.

[40] Ibid., p. 12.

[41] Dumond, Antislavery Origins of the Civil War, p. 17.

[42] Garrison is quoted in Walter M. Merrill and Louis Ruchames, eds., The Letters of William Lloyd Garrison, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), 1: 124. The letter was to his brother-in-law, Henry Benson, dated July 30, 1831. Also see Garrison's stinging but logical letters to Gerrit Smith, in which Garrison tried to dissuade the wealthy philanthropist from supporting colonization, ibid., 1: 444-463.

[43] Ibid., p. 10. These criticisms were reiterated by Garrison in the chapter headings of his book, each one a summary of one reason for his rejection of colonization. Colonization "is not hostile to slavery," colonization "recognizes slaves as property," etc.

[44] See, for instance, Davis, "Emergence of Immediatism," where the American situation is related to the English experience. Davis stresses that the American switch to immediatism was part of a broader, international trend toward radicalism. Gilbert H. Barnes and Dwight L. Dumond, eds., Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimke Weld and Sarah Grimke, 1822-1844, 2 vols. (New York, 1934), relate the early efforts of Tappan to form a national society in the introduction to vol. 1. Barnes and Dumond exaggerate Weld's importance in some areas of early abolition, and are very biased against Garrison.

[45] On the failure of gradualism see Merrill, Garrison Letters, 1: 438 and 456, and Davis, "Emergence of Immediatism," p. 227, where he notes that "Earlier plans and programs had evoked little popular excitement. . . ."

[46] Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, p. 193, contends that the appeal to conscience was strongest in areas revived by Finney.

[47] Merrill, Garrison Letters, 1: 455, to Gerrit Smith. The first issue of the Liberator was published on January 1, 1831. Garrison, however, first advocated immediatism in 1829.

[48] See, for instance, Weld's letter to Garrison in Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 98, where Weld describes his feelings about the sinfulness of slavery. Most abolitionists who believed that immediate emancipation was morally right expressed their views in harsh terms.

[49] L. W. Ryckman, "Address to the Workingmen of New England," Harbinger, June 21, 1845.

[50] Donald G. Mathews, "The Abolitionists on Slavery: The Critique Behind the Social Movement," JSH 33 (1967): 167. Mathews argues that "behind the flamboyant rhetoric . . . there was a [balanced] legitimate critique of slavery," p. 164.

[51] According to one account, Wendell Phillips was moved to support abolition after seeing Garrison mobbed in Boston. Weld and his convert Birney became immediatists in 1833. The Tappan brothers, wealthy New York merchants, also helped guide the movement. They were instrumental in forming the AASS, and, in 1840, the A & F. Along with Gerrit Smith and Birney, they pumped enormous sums into various abolitionist causes. See Benjamin Quarles, "Sources of Abolitionist Income," MVHR 32 (1945): 63-76.

[52] Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 125-126.

[53] For an in-depth view of the historiographical school that emphasizes the abolitionists' prejudice, see Jane H. Pease and William H. Pease, They Who Would be Free: Blacks' Search for Freedom, 1830-1861 (New York, 1974). Two earlier, more succinct statements of their thesis are "Antislavery Ambivalence: Immediatism, Expediency, and Race," Am. Q. 17 (winter 1965): 682-695 and "Ends, Means and Attitudes: Black-White Conflict in the Antislavery Movement," CWH 18 (1972): 117-128. One antidote to this view is James M. McPherson, "A Brief for Equality: The Abolitionist Reply to the Racist Myth, 1860-1865," chap. 8 of Martin Duberman, The Antislavery Vanguard: New Essays on the Abolitionists (Princeton, N. J., 1965). McPherson expands on this early work in chap. 6 of The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction (Princeton, N. J., 1964). McPherson's recent Abolitionist Legacy (1975) traces the racial attitudes of abolitionists from 1865 to the founding of the NAACP. Chapter 4, particularly pp. 66-70 and chap. 18, passim., deal in detail with the issues of racism and paternalism. McPherson concludes that while some abolitionists believed in racial differences, "egalitarianism was dominant" in their attitudes and actions.

[54] Merrill, Garrison Letters, 1: 458-459.

[55] Quoted in Kraditor, Means and Ends in American Abolitionism, p. 5.

[56] See Clifford Griffin, "The Abolitionists and the Benevolent Societies," JNH 44 (1959): 195-216. Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, pp. 195-196 remarks that the cent societies, originally formed to spread the Word (penny donations were contributed weekly to church groups, hence the name), became totally devoted to antislavery.

[57] Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 126-127.

[58] Ibid., 1: 147-148.

[59] Ibid., vol. 1, p. xxiii.

[60] Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, p. 198.

[61] Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 133. The vote to oppose colonization was unanimous despite the fact that President Beecher's daughter Catherine had presented her father's personal plan for colonization. "Without preceiving any inconsistency," notes Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, p. 198, "he considered himself both a colonizationist and an abolitionist." The only biography of Weld to date is Benjamin Thomas' Theodore Weld: Crusader for Freedom (New Brunswick, N.J., 1950).

[62] See, for instance, Dumond, Antislavery Origins of the Civil War, p. 19 and p. 35.

[63] Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 133.

[64] After nearly completing his academic work at Oberlin, Weld became the AASS agent in Ohio during 1834. His eloquence overcame hostility and physical violence in hundreds of towns. In 1837, after losing his voice, he directed the famous "Band of Seventy," which abolitionized the West. The discussion of Lane Seminary is indebted to ibid., 1: 125-128, 132-135, 137-146; to Barnes, Antislavery Impulse, pp. 64-78; to Dumond, Antislavery Origins of the Civil War, pp. 28-36; and to Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, pp. 198-200. Thomas Theodore Weld, recounts the Lane debates, and the events leading to the exodus of Lane students to Oberlin in chap. 5.

[65] Quoted in Dumond, Antislavery Origins of the Civil War, p. 36.

[66] Adams, Power of Ideals, p. 46.

[67] Mob violence is discussed most fully in Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, pp. 501-508. Also see Dumond, Antislavery Origins of the Civil War, chap. 4.

[68] Quoted in Barnes, Antislavery Impulse, pp. 100-101. Craven, Coming of the Civil War, p. 145, notes that the AASS in 1837-38 published 7877 bound volumes, 47,256 tracts and pamphlets, 4100 circulars, and 10,490 prints. The quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine had a circulation of 9,000, the Slave's Friend (for children) 131,050, the monthly Human Rights 189,400, and the weekly Emancipator 217,000.

[69] For a typical petition form, see Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 175.

[70] Attempts to censure John Quincy Adams failed. Giddings, censured in 1842, was reelected two months later. See Tyler,

Freedom's Ferment, pp. 509-511. For Weld's role in the antislavery lobby see Barnes and Dumond, *Weld-Grimke Letters*, vol. 1, intro., p. xvi, where the editors state that "political experts recognized . . . that in the question of Giddings' reelection the entire issue of party regularity and party insurgency was joined. If the Whig party could secure his defeat, antislavery insurgency was doomed, but if they failed and he was reelected, insurgency would receive its vindication. Whig leaders in Ohio as well as in Washington threw the whole weight of party interest behind him, but their efforts were vain. For Giddings' district . . . was the very one in which the Lane Seminary students had begun the abolition revival; and the issue there was not party regularity; it was the righteousness of the antislavery cause. Giddings was returned by a large majority. . . ." Thomas, *Theodore Weld*, chap. 14, also discusses the antislavery lobby in Washington.

[71] Kraditor, *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism*, p. 7.

[72] The original masthead of the *Liberator* (January 1, 1831) read "Our country is the world -/ Our countrymen are mankind." Information on Garrison's beliefs can be found in any of his biographies. See, for instance, Walter M. Merrill, *Against Wind and Tide: A Biography of William Lloyd Garrison* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963). Ibid., chaps. 2-6, deals with Garrison's beliefs in terms of radical and conservative positions within the abolition movement.

[73] Weld was one who put abolition first. "The Providence of God has for some time made it plain to me that the Abolition of Slavery and the elevation of the free colored race have intrinsic demands upon me superior to every other cause," Barnes and Dumond, *Weld-Grimke Letters*, 1: 152. The moderate group is sometimes referred to as the "New York group" to distinguish it from ultraistic Boston.

[74] See Kraditor, *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism*, p. 7, and Dumond, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War*, pp. 65-66. Many radical abolitionists, because of their belief that the Constitution was a pro-slavery pact, supported the idea of a "higher law." It was on this basis that Theodore Parker and other radicals formed vigilante associations to free Negroes imprisoned under the Fugitive Slave Law, which provided the presiding judge with $10 for every "slave" returned to the South, and $5 if the Negro were declared free.

[75] Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, p. 499, states that Garrison *chose* to split the movement over the question of woman's rights (my emphasis). Kraditor, *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism*, pp. 95-104 documents Garrison's charge that the moderates plotted to oust the radicals. Thomas, *Theodore Weld*, chap. 13, gives one of the fullest accounts of the backstage mánoeuvres prior to the 1840 split.

[76] Kraditor, *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism*, p. 104.

[77] Ibid., p. 185. It should be noted that a great deal of political in-fighting accompanied the slow and arduous merger of Libertymen with the Free Soil coalition. Dillon, in "Failure of American Abolitionists," believes that radical abolition was completely forfeited with the move to political action in 1840, but he fails to deal with the truncated AASS. McPherson, on the other hand, has meticulously researched the political and moral positions of Garrisonians, evangelistic abolitionists and political abolitionists from 1865 to 1909 in Abolitionist Legacy. In their reactions to Reconstruction policies, to the Liberal Republican movement, to racism and to the Niagra movement, Garrisonian abolitionists maintained a greater degree of radicalism than any other group of abolitionists. McPherson feels that his findings lend credence to Aileen Kraditor's assertion that antebellum Garrisonians were the most radical faction. Some of McPherson's most important conclusions and supporting statistics can be found in Abolitionist Legacy, pp. 33-34, p. 49, p. 79, pp. 91-92, and in chap. 20, especially pp. 391-392.

[78] See n. 70, above, p. 63.

[79] The attitudes of these radical abolitionists will be discussed in the conclusion. The abolitionists' fight for equality is the focus of several studies by James McPherson. See n. 53 and n. 70, above. Some of the less famous radicals were L. M. Child, Theodore Tilton, Sidney Gay, and Moncure Conway. Weld, after his crucial work in the antislavery lobby, was no longer an active abolitionist. Editors Barnes and Dumond, in the introduction to vol. 1, Weld-Grimke Letters, sum up the story: "Convinced that his work in Congress was done, repelled by the measures of the 'Garrison men,' unwilling to join Lewis Tappan's 'anti-woman society,' and believing that the time had not yet come for a separate political party, Weld was shut out from all antislavery action. [With few exceptions,] he spent the remainder of his life teaching . . . ."

CHAPTER II

Abolition and the Labor Movement: "The Slavery of Wages"

1

The organization of stable labor unions based on their members' class consciousness belongs to the traditional Industrial Age of 1885-1914. The first national and city-wide trade unions, however, were organized between 1828 and 1870. These earlier unions were prompted by a desire to ameliorate the dismal working conditions of urban laborers, and by an emerging belief that wage earners, as a group, were at odds with their employers over the amount of the weekly wage. To distinguish these early stirrings from the intense class consciousness of the late nineteenth century, one historian of American labor has called this 1830's awakening "wage-consciousness."[1] Articles in union newspapers, trade union constitutions and numerous speeches by labor leaders all support this contention. In the 1830's urban workers began to separate themselves from the colonial guild-like structure that was characterized by harmony among the master craftsman, journeyman and apprentice. Employers' attempts to realize a profit by reducing wages "drove the wage earner as such to his first conscious union with competing labourers in defence against the master-workman who had now [by 1830] become the 'boss.'"[2] This wage consciousness did not steadily mature over the next fifty years, nor did the labor movement it bolstered culminate in strong, well-established unions similar to late nineteenth century organizations such as the American Federation of Labor. Was this the fault of the powerful abolition movement? Modern historians who agree with Avery Craven and Alice Tyler that abolition "swallowed up" other antebellum reforms imply that this is so.[3] To the contrary, antebellum attempts to organize workers did not decrease as abolition gained strength. It is true that early labor organization was sporadic, and that some labor leaders and unions supported the political abolition movement during the 1840's and 1850's. The difficulty in organizing American workers, however, was caused by a nexus of historical conditions -- not solely by "absorption" into abolition. Before detailing the chronological development of labor organizations and attitudes, these historical restraints on early labor organization must be pinpointed.

Paramount among these factors were the numerous depressions, recessions, and panics that constantly interrupted prewar economic growth. The most serious ones occurred in 1819, 1837, and 1857. Each time labor organization was suddenly halted, with newly-won concessions often lost. By mid-century it was apparent that in prosperous years workers initiated their most successful strikes, organized unions, and won important demands. When depressions hit unions floundered, strikes failed, fledgling union newspapers succumbed to the financial strain, and the central control of the unions was weakened. However, the need for organization persisted, and despite their depleted condition labor organizations resurfaced with the next economic upturn. Another impediment to organization for strike action was the existing legal code. Until an 1842 Massachusetts Supreme Court decision handed down by the prominent Lemuel Shaw, any group of employees which sought a wage hike could be prosecuted as a criminal conspiracy. In the 1842 Commonwealth versus Hunt case, the right to form unions and strike for higher wages was established.

The labor movement was also slowed down by its varied ethnic composition. Not only did the important and radical German-American group maintain its own organizations, but other immigrant segments of the working class retained their native culture and language, remaining outside the mainstream of early American labor organization.

The idea of progress, interpreted in various ways by labor leaders as justification for their reforms, was construed quite differently by capitalists. One American historian has found that employers often invoked the idea of progress "to show that the hardships of the factory system were only temporary evils to be displaced eventually by an era of production and plenty in which the mass of the people might more largely share."[4] Labor leaders, as expected, felt that progress would be achieved only if labor's position in the new economic order paralleled that of their employers.

There were several engrained social concepts that prevented a vigorous emergence of class consciousness from surfacing. The prevailing Christian attitudes, especially the belief in the brotherhood of all men, made it difficult for many workers to accept the rhetoric of class struggle. More important was the continued existence of "vertical mobility," which encouraged men to believe that they might one day themselves become masters, or capitalists. Indeed, journeymen had always been accepted as their masters' social equals, and "the colonial conception of a journeyman as tomorrow's master mechanic was neither dead nor fully obsolete by 1820. . . ." Not only did the skilled artisans and mechanics who formed the earliest trade unions attempt to preserve this honored status, but they also saw themselves as "expectant capitalists," hoping one day to shed their temporary role as worker for that of the capitalist employer. As one historian has phrased it,

> Joining a union meant for the average man that he had given up the possibility of promotion through his individual merits, with his own business in the offing. Certainly there would be no advantage to strengthening an organization which one expected later to fight.[5]

Slavery was another divisive issue for early labor, in part because the abolition movement did not incorporate the cause of northern wage slavery into its program, and in part because the existence of slavery itself, workers came to believe, was inimical to free labor. All these factors -- the existence of slavery, repeated depressions, the early illegality of strike action, the independence of ethnic groups, and the social concepts that militated against class consciousness -- all these undercut the steady growth of labor organization.

Modern historians of antebellum reform who believe that abolition eclipsed other movements fail to acknowledge the complex interaction between labor and abolition. Their relationship was more intricate than the simple question of labor's absorption into political abolition during the 1850's. The two movements were motivated by many of the same impulses to reform, and both faced similar decisions concerning their developing ideology, tactics and goals. Although labor's organizational strength was channeled into Free Soil, Republicanism, and support of the Civil War, this was a tactical decision by labor's leaders. During the 1850's they recognized that free labor's problems could be dealt with only after slavery was eliminated.

ii

Two early nineteenth century phenomena profoundly affected the American worker: urban growth and industrial expansion. Sustained industrial growth began in 1830, ushering in deep-seated economic changes and attendant social dislocation. Household crafts and custom manufacturing began to give way to the mass production of urban workshops and factories, and the tremendous eighteenth century shipping fortunes were invested in manufacturing, real estate, banks, railroads and commercial farming. In 1820 6 percent of the population lived in cities; by 1860 cities contained 20 percent of all Americans, including thousands of immigrants. Agrarian America, characterized in revolutionary days by the small farmer and independent worker, was rapidly becoming urban and industrial. The concomitant changes came too fast to be absorbed into the existing social structure, creating a lag which spurred both short-term remedial action and wide-ranging reform movements. Philanthropy and charitable organizations boomed in the 1830's as immediate, stopgap responses to the plight of poor, unemployed workers, impoverished immigrants, and other destitute Americans who crowded into cities. After the panic of 1837 the urban poor, many of whom were workers, became a permanent segment of every city's population. Charitable agencies settled down to their endless task of providing relief.[6]

The laboring class was hardest hit by the economic and social change of these years. Although many sought temporary relief in order to endure financial crises, wage earners also consistently sought to secure their future by organizing into associations and unions.

The unions and workers' parties of the late 1820's are identified as America's earliest labor movement. Trade associations did exist before this period, but were scattered, short-lived, and often organized for benevolent purposes. Despite the many strikes in east coast cities during the decade 1800-1810, skilled workers' demands for shorter hours or more pay were usually unsuccessful. The instigators often ended up in court fighting conspiracy charges.[7] These fragile organizations and their attempts at strike action were pragmatic reactions to immediate problems, with the focus on job security and conditions of employment. Demands were for short-term remedial solutions, and were not the outgrowth of any ideology. The only governing ideas expressed by early trade associations concerned the principles of equality and liberty inherent in the ideology of the American Revolution. Such justification, coupled with arguments that the condition of the laboring classes was inhumane, became more articulate as the labor movement gained strength in the late 1820's and early 1830's.

In 1827, Philadelphia journeymen carpenters lost a strike aimed at reducing their work day to ten hours. Their resolution calling for an end of the dawn-to-dusk work day contended that, "house carpenters [of Philadelphia and the surrounding county] have for a long time suffered under a grievous and slave like system of labour. . . ."[8] The failure of this strike led to the formation of a central, city-wide labor organization, the Mechanics' Union of Trade Associations. Based on the principles of "strictest justice, and . . . extended philanthropy," its object was

> to avert ... the desolating evils which must inevitably arise from a depreciation of the intrinsic value of human labor; to raise the ... productive classes to that condition of true independence and equality ... and [to establish] ... a just balance of power, both mental, moral, political and scientific, between all the various classes and individuals which constitute society at large.[9]

The association was divided on the question of political action, and though the Mechanics' Union constitution rejected independent political action, some of its members formed the Working Men's Party (1828-1831), the world's first labor party. It ran its own slate of "workie" candidates, as well as supporting Democratic candidates sympathetic to their demands. The party was determined to represent its interests "as a class" through demands for free public education (knowledge was thought to be the cornerstone of liberty, and education should be equally available to all men), an end to monopolies and banks, and abolition of the debtor's prison.[10] Formation of similar workingmen's parties spread rapidly along the east coast in the next six years, with sixty-eight labor newspapers and sixty-one workingmen's parties created.[11] Additional demands were articulated: workers wanted a revision of the militia system, a less expensive legal system, equalization of property taxes, a lien law for laborers, institution of a district system of election, removal of religious restrictions on suffrage and office-holding, and an end to the use of cheap convict labor.[12] Banks were one particular focus of reform for, as labor saw it, they existed to "perpetuate an aristocracy which eventually may shake the foundations of our liberties and entail slavery upon our posterity." Some associations recognized the existence of "two distinct classes, the rich and the poor; the oppressed and the oppressor. . . ."[13] Or, they discerned "symptoms of a revolution, which will be second to none save that of '76. . . ." The Farmers', Mechanics' and Workingmen's Advocate (August 21, 1830), wanted "to impart to its laws and administration those principles of liberty and equality unfolded in the Declaration of Independence."[14] Seth Luther, carpenter and labor agitator, urged New England workingmen in 1832 to "awake":

> Our cause is the cause of truth -- of justice and humanity. It must prevail. Let us be determined no longer to be deceived by the cry of those who produce nothing and who enjoy all, and who insultingly term us -- the farmers, the mechanics and labourers, and LOWER ORDERS -- and exultantly claim our homage for themselves, as the
>
> Higher ORDERS --
>
> While the DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE asserts that
>
> 'ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL.'[15]

The New England Association of Farmers, Mechanics and other Workmen, in addition to the usual demands, organized in order to "maintain their rights as American Freemen."[16] The demands of these early organizations, however, also reflected the broad humanitarianism of the day.

The most radical segment of the early labor movement was located in New York City, where in 1829 six thousand workers protested the proposed lengthening of the ten hour day.[17] A political party (the New York Workingmen's Party) was formed under the leadership of Free Enquirers Robert Dale Owen and Frances Wright, land reformer George Henry Evans, and machinist-land reformer Thomas Skidmore. The fledgling party not only successfully struck to protest the extension of the working day, but also elected a member to the state assembly in November, 1829, with three other candidates losing by very slim margins. Several upstate New York workers' tickets came close to total victory in electing their slates.[18] Through their influential newspaper, the Working Man's Advocate (which long outlasted its parent organization), the New York party endorsed many humanitarian reforms as well as the principles of unionism and strike action. Yet from its inception factionalism was rife. Many workers rejected the contention of Owen and Skidmore that private ownership of property was a "monstrous evil"; other rank and file workers were aghast at Wright and Owen's radical ideas on marriage. Workers looked askance at these unskilled intellectuals, and the basest insult of the day was to be labeled "a Fanny Wright man."[19] The radical leaders themselves were in disagreement. Skidmore, whose plan for reorganizing society by giving every man over twenty-one 160 acres, withdrew from the party to form his own enclave. Owen, Wright and Evans, who recognized an open "war of class" and hoped to level those barriers, advocated state guardianship of all children, whom they wanted educated absolutely equally in government boarding schools.[20] The two radical groups agreed on other moderate planks (or "reformist," as workers termed them), such as adoption of a lien law. The Owen-Wright faction was persistently lambasted as socialistic and anarchic by moderate workers and the traditional, conservative press. The moderate faction warned its followers "to preserve the civil institutions of your country from the baneful, leveling system of a fanatical set of foreigners."[21] Such factionalism bred the expected result. The New York Workingmen's Party folded by 1831. Political labor movements in other east coast cities faced similar problems, or found that many of their reformist demands, such as passage of a lien law or abolition of debtors' prison, had been achieved not through independent political action, but by pressuring existing parties.[22]

The period between 1831 and 1836 witnessed an unprecedented economic boom, and during these prosperous times numerous strikes were won, increasing pay and shortening hours. Societies that had been submerged by the recession of 1828-1831 resurfaced. Local unions coalesced into city-wide groups, which endorsed broad-based humanitarian programs. The General Trades' Union of New York City, formed in 1833 with printer Ely Moore as its president,[23] provided the impetus for organizing the nation's first national trades union. This National Trades Union, formed in 1834 with 300,000 members, concentrated on achieving reformist objectives. It eschewed political action, apparently afraid that an independent political party would destroy the original organization, as had happened with the Philadelphia Mechanics' Union six years earlier.[24]

A strong political labor movement, however, did emerge in the 1830's. Workers within the New York Democratic party rebelled against the Tammany machine in 1835 to nominate a slate of "anti-monopoly" candidates sympathetic to their problems. Tammany leaders in turn called a meeting to have their own slate of "banker" candidates endorsed. When the slate was rejected, they abandoned the meeting to the radical group. On their way out of the hall they employed the usual tactic for squelching such an uprising by turning off the gas. The workers were prepared, and continued their rally after lighting candles with "locofoco" matches. Dubbed locofocos by the Whig press, their radical Democratic slate failed dismally in the ensuing elections. When it became clear that their protests had not affected Tammany's attitudes or candidates, the locofocos split from the Democrats early in 1836 to form the Equal Rights Party. As the new party gained enough voter support to form a power bloc, all but the "ultras" returned to the somewhat reformed Tammany Hall Democratic machine.[25]

The initial locofoco dissention, and subsequent formation of the independent Equal Rights Party, were sparked by more than dissatisfaction with the Tammany banker ticket. The 1835 conviction of twenty-five union tailors on criminal conspiracy charges was opposed by thousands of workers. One leaflet, titled "The Rich Against the Poor!" urged organized demonstration with this declaration:

> A deadly blow has been struck at your liberty! The prize for which your fathers fought has been robbed from you! The freemen of the North are now on a level with the slave of the South! with no other privilege than laboring that drones may fatten on your life blood!

The ensuing protest at City Hall park drew twenty-seven thousand citizens. The conspiracy conviction was termed "a concerted plan of the aristocracy to take from them [the workers] that Liberty which was bequeathed to them . . . by their revolutionary sires," and a convention was planned to form a legitimate and independent workingman's party.[26] The result was the Equal Rights Party, which aimed at placing "the property of the rich . . . on the same footing with the labors of the poor."[27] One New York labor paper compared this revolution "against charters and monopolies" with "the revolution of 1776,"[28] but although their tone was radical, the Equal Rights Party had no radical ideology to guide them. They concentrated on reformist goals, eventually disbanding in favor of intra-party or third party pressure.[29]

The depression which engulfed America from 1837-1843 helped spread locofoco dissent along the northeast coast. Union organizations, however, were decimated by the economic situation.[30] By September "nine-tenths of the eastern factories had closed," and there were 33,000 commercial and industrial failures totalling losses of 440 million dollars. 1836 had been peppered by 72 strikes initiated by 43 crafts. In 1837, there were only 9, and most of those occurred in the West.[31] In New York the 1837 panic underscored the economic distress caused a year earlier by the Great Fire, which cost many their jobs and jacked up prices. In February, 1837, an Equal Rights Party meeting turned into the famous flour riots, but the result of mob action against the warehouses was simply to raise the price of flour by a dollar a barrel.[32] The depression also caused overnight disappearance of many unions. Those that remained were crippled not only by the economic situation, but also by the 1835 conviction of the union tailors. Combined, these conditions destroyed unions, reinforced the illegality of uniting for wage increases, and made labor spokesmen, if not the average worker, amenable to the 1840's panaceas of utopian socialism and land reform.

The utopian experiments that flourished briefly in the 1840's were derived primarily from the philosophy of Charles Fourier, whose ideas were popularized in America by Albert Brisbane. Progress, Brisbane declared, had to be pursued through complete social reorganization, and the Fourier plan was based on the substitution of cooperation for competition. Many independent socialistic communities, operating on Fourier's principles, were established during the decade, but the problems of industrialism were not to be solved by communal withdrawal. The most direct link between legitimate labor and the Associationists was L. W. Ryckman, president of the New England Workingmen's Association and a resident at the Brook Farm phalanx.

Labor radicalism was diverted into other social and economic reforms during the 1840's. There were numerous communistic associations, plans for producers' and consumers' cooperatives, anarchistic schemes for revolutionizing the economic basis of exchange, and philosophies based on land reform.[33] Each one appealed to a segment of the working class, with land reform claiming the most support. Land reform was preached most ardently by George Henry Evans, who urged Americans to "Vote yourself a farm." To Evans, owning land was a natural right, and his basic proposal was to alot 160 acres to every adult, with provisions for then exchanging land only for land, and products only for products. Capitalism would thus be eliminated. Through his National Reform Association, he deprecated land monopoly as the root of all labor's difficulties, promising that unemployment would be cured by dividing the national domain into homesteads for actual settlers. Utopian visions had an intense, but brief, appeal to laborers. Most workers found that with the return of prosperity in the 1850's, their future lay with industrialism, and not on the land. Utopianism offered solutions that were unworkable or unrealistic to wage earners whose livelihood increasingly depended on factory employment. The decade before the Civil War was characterized by a rekindling of the 1830's wage consciousness coupled with intense struggles against adverse working conditions.

During these three decades of labor agitation the organization of unions and the formulation of an ideology coincided with the growth of the abolition movement. Did abolition engulf the unstable labor movement, as some historians imply? Clearly, there were other factors, particularly the deadening effects of depressions and diversion into utopianism, which retarded the pace of the labor movement; yet abolition and labor did effect each other in essential ways.

From 1831 to the 1840's the abolition movement, though generally sympathetic to labor's problems, did not support that struggling movement. The strongest stand against labor was penned by William Lloyd Garrison in the first issue of the Liberator (January 1, 1831):

> An attempt has been made . . . we regret to say, with considerable success -- to inflame the minds of our working classes against the more opulent, and to persuade men that they are contemned and oppressed by a wealthy aristocracy. That public grievances exist, is unquestionably true; but they are not confined to any one class of society. Every profession is interested in their removal -- the rich as well as the poor. It is in the highest degree criminal, therefore, to exasperate our mechanics to deeds of violence, or to array them under a party banner; for it is not true,

> that, at any time, they have been the objects of reproach. Labor is not dishonorable. . . . We are the friends of reform; but that is not reform, which, in curing one evil, threatens to inflict a thousand others.

Garrison's words are often quoted, even though his opinion was not generally shared by his colleagues. Despite his stubbornness in excluding labor organization from his otherwise all-embracing humanitarian program, Garrison did include articles sympathetic to labor in his newspaper. The May 14, 1831 issue, for instance, declared that northern workers were to "an alarming extent, despised and wronged." Garrison's personal disavowal of the labor cause, however, was constant. In the National Anti-Slavery Standard of June 20, 1850, Garrison reiterated his opinion: "We are already staggering under the load of responsibilities connected with what we deem to be . . . the most radical movement on the American soil."

Garrison's unequivocal repudiation of the labor cause must have disappointed labor leaders, especially since the 1830-1831 period yielded few other advances either through strikes or independent party organization. Garrison's stinging comment did provoke written rebuttals, and labor ideology was developed in part through its reaction to the existence of slavery and to the opposition of abolition movement.[34] In this particular instance, William West, a labor reformer who later headed Evans' National Reform Association, urged Garrison to consider an alliance between labor and abolition in a letter published in the Liberator (January 29, 1831):

> Although you do not appear to have perceived it, I think there is a very intimate connexion between the interests of the workingmen's party and your own. YOU are striving to excite the attention of your country men to the

> injustice of holding their fellow men in bondage, and depriving them of the fruits of their toil. WE are aiming at a similar object, only in application to another portion of our fellow men. In the history of the origin of slavery is to be found the explanation of those evils WE deplore and seek to remove, as well as of those you have attacked. The inequalities in the condition of the citizens and families of this republic have originated in the same causes.

One source of their common oppression, West continued, lay in the assumption by a fortunate few "of the right to command the labor and services of the mass of their fellow countrymen -- either as slaves . . . or operatives, and to renumerate them for their labor, only to such an extent as they in their sovereign pleasure saw meet to bestow." All laborers, West argued, were kept in ignorance (both labor and abolition urged universal education), and indolence, vice and depravity were engendered by this condition. He added that, "The perpetuation of opinions, habits of thinking, deportment and usage, towards those working classes, which though nominally free, still are in Europe and America . . . dependent on the power and the will of the wealthy, educated and exalted." The elevated class regarded workers as "deficient in the intellectual capacity and moral ability to become equal to the fortunate few in those refinements and accomplishments. . . ." West believed that abolition and labor were both moral movements which sought to enlighten and educate oppressed segments of the population as to their rights and duties. Theodore Parker, the radical Unitarian minister who immersed himself in a score of antebellum reform movements, was one abolitionist who deplored the coexistence of low wages and high profits. He based his plea for "better pay, shorter hours, [and] decent housing" on the rights of the laboring classes, and not on the exigency of Christian philanthropy. Decades ahead of social gospellers in urging a Christian solution to the problems of labor and the urban poor, Parker used his pulpit to focus attention on the cause-effect relationship between crime and the triple social evils of poverty, unemployment and ignorance. Bitterly denunciatory in his "Sermon on Merchants," he pointed to the "bloated opulence and starving penury in the same street" as evidence that labor is at the mercy of capital.[35]

Many other abolitionists, especially those who were adamant that their movement retain its moral tone, insisted that abolition not become a broad-based economic reform by allying with the labor cause. A small but vocal group, however, recognized that workers represented an important source of potential support.[36] Several prominent antislavery men, notably W. E. Channing and Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune, believed that northern workers should not be alienated and that all forms of slavery must be opposed.[37] Even orthodox abolitionists warned northern workers that continued existence of slavery was inimical to their cause. The Liberator (May 14, 1831) cautioned that an aristocracy in the North and South was aiming "to degrade and defraud workingmen of all classes, irrespective of color." The AASS and several state societies declared that slavery degraded all labor by "[blighting] the industry of the nation by making labor disreputable."[38] James Birney, especially when he was involved in political abolition during the 1840's, emphasized the hostility between free and slave labor. Northern workers, he contended, had to suffer with tariff reductions meant to benefit southern slaveholders. "Where labor is partly free and partly slave," he said, "the same legislation cannot be made beneficial to both."[39] Abolitionists also urged workers to stop aiding the oppression of slaves. An 1846 antislavery convention in the factory town of Lowell, Massachusetts, wanted labor support because

> workingmen and mechanics . . . themselves are the victims of oppression and are therefore specially called upon to remember that those that are in bonds are bound with them; because it is impossible for them to obtain their just rights, so long as the vast body of southern laborers are held and driven as beasts of burden; because there must be chains for all or liberty for all. . . .[40]

Abolitionists and antislavery newspapers stressed too that if slaves were free, the newly-created consumer market would boost both demand and wages. If Negroes continued in bondage, however, they might be used as factory workers, producing goods that would undersell those manufactured in the North. And, as one journal prophesied,

> The free artisan must come sooner or later to know that chattel slavery must be followed by wages slavery -- that a bar of iron and a web of cotton cloth are of no caste, and neither suffer or gain by the prejudice of color. . . . The nominally free operative, engaged upon the same kind of labor with the black slave, must take substantially the same condition.[41]

Such appeals by abolitionist and antislavery journals appeared frequently, especially during the 1840's and 1850's. The reaction of laborers, as seen both in their newspapers and in the attitudes of their leaders, spanned from active hostility to ardent support.

Anti-abolition was evident in a small but vociferous group of workers and their leaders. Hostility sprung from several sources. Northern white labor had long feared competition from free Negroes, and one historian of American labor notes that when northern workers

> found emancipated blacks with low living standards crowding into [the] cities, . . . competing for jobs the lower class of unskilled white laborers wanted, they turned against the movement because they believed that the abolition of slavery would bring increased economic competition.[42]

Radical prejudice was another factor, but not a major source of labor's criticism of abolition. Workers were more worried that continued antislavery and abolitionist agitation would upset commercial relations with the South, causing an economic plunge. One workingman bitterly denounced abolitionists as wealthy hypocrites who

> [basked] in the sunshine of wealth obtained by pilfering the mechanic's labor, by shaving the poor farmers, and starving the wretched famine-driven laborer! No wonder these hucksters of the nation's wealth reverence the 'wages slavery' seeing that it condemns the masses to become the brutal drudges, the mere living pullies of the commercial machine, and that machine their property![43]

The tract, which was couched in the inflammatory rhetoric popularized by the abolitionists, was titled, Abolitionism Unveiled! Hypocrisy Unmasked! and Knavery Scourged! Luminously Portraying the Formal Hocusses, Whining Philanthropists, Moral Coquets, Practical Atheists, and the Hollow-Hearted Swindlers of Labor Yclept [called] the 'Northern Abolitionists.'

Such bitter hostility was rare.[44] A more typical labor reaction was disinterest based on an emerging class consciousness.[45] Even for those workers who hated slavery, their own immediate interests took precedence over abolition. William West spoke for most northern workers when he wrote in the Liberator (September 25, 1846) that, "They do not hate chattel slavery less, but they hate wages slavery more." From 1845 until the Emancipation Proclamation labor journals reiterated the growing belief that wage slavery was as bad, if not far worse, than chattel slavery. The Working Man's Advocate (March 16, 1844) told its readers that the northern wage slave was not any less enslaved than the Negro. Capitalism, it said, "has a lash more potent than the whipthong to stimulate the energies of his white slaves: the fear of want."[46] Labor leaders argued that slaveholders who had a direct economic investment in their workers were motivated to care for them, even in sickness and old age. "Every . . . man will take care of his cattle, hogs, and horses. . . ." noted a Young America article. "But he who hires labor, whether men or animals, gives the smallest amount of pay for the greatest amount of work. . . ."[47] Northern workers had no advantage over the chattel slave and were in fact subject not to one master, but to a "master class." Southerners especially emphasized this line of argument as part of their pro-slavery repertoire. Senator James Hammond of South Carolina said that the difference between northern and southern labor

> is that our slaves are hired for life and [are] well compensated; there is no starvation, no begging, no want of employment. . . . Yours are hired by the day, not cared for, and scantily compensated, which may be proved in the most deplorable manner, at any hour in any street of your large towns.[48]

The reformist groups which allied with labor during the 1840's were sympathetic to emancipation, but urged abolition of all types of slavery. Albert Brisbane, writing in the Fourierist organ the Harbinger (June 21, 1845) warned abolitionists that a new kind of bondage awaited freedmen unless wage slavery were eliminated as well. He was convinced that if abolitionists would adopt the cause of "the slavery of capital . . . this extension would give them [abolitionists] immense additional power." L. W. Ryckman, an Associationist and president of the New England Workingmen's Association, also advocated abolition of all slavery, wage and chattel.[49]

Even as Brisbane, Ryckman and legitimate labor leaders criticized abolition for its narrow definition of slavery, they were sympathetic to that movement's aims. In the Harbinger (October 4, 1845), for instance, the National Industrial Congress stated that, "the Abolition movement, sincere, ardent, heroic with attacks upon chattel slavery has not succeeded, because those engaged in it have not perceived that it was only one of the many modes of oppression that productive labor has to endure, which every where condemn him to ignorance and want." In 1837 another labor newspaper declared that the abolition movement was "establishing principles and precedents for the use of all oppressed laborers without distinction of color."[50] As early as 1829, the New York Workingman's Party made abolition of slavery part of its program, and throughout the antebellum period labor newspapers evinced a generally sympathetic attitude toward emancipation, a sentiment underscored by the numerous antislavery societies formed by local unions.[51] Active support of abolition became more marked, however, in the period after 1840, when the issue of "non-extension" of slavery into new territories began to emerge. With the independence of Texas, the locofoco Massachusetts legislature feared that possible annexation of a new enslaved state "will furnish new calumnies against republican governments, by exposing the gross contradiction of a people professing to be free, and yet seeking to extend and perpetuate the subjection of their slaves (Liberator, Nov. 8, 1844).

Similar statements were made after the proposal of the Wilmot Proviso and during the Mexican War. As the North became more amenable to antislavery ideas and to free territories, "a large number of the workers and their leaders perceived the cogency of the arguments of the necessity for the working classes to align with those who fought the enslavement of the blacks."[52] Labor also worried that if slavery were allowed in the vast western lands, free labor would not only be restricted to a relatively small area, but would certainly suffer lower wages as well. An 1845 labor meeting attended by Brisbane, Greeley, Owen, and twenty-five thousand workers denounced "slavery in the abstract, slavery in the concrete . . . slavery absolute, slavery feudal, and the slavery of wages. . . ."[53] In 1847, the New England Labor Reform League declared that, "American slavery must be uprooted before the elevation sought by the laboring classes can be effected."[54] Even the German-American labor organization changed its policy after the Kansas-Nebraska dispute, and supported abolition on moral grounds. In addition, most labor newspapers gave non-extension their unqualified support.

Labor support of abolition during the prosperous 1850's resulted from a belief that slavery had "emerged as the greatest obstacle to the solution of the labor question, and the plantation masters as the worst enemies of the working class."[55] Land reform schemes were also threatened by the possible extension of slavery, and free labor feared confinement to the northeast, with its attendant economic disadvantages. Even though the depressions of 1837-1843 and 1857 meant financial ruin for many labor organizations and their newspapers, support for the war was not significantly diminished. Pamphlets and leaflets written by workingmen urged a pro-Union stand, and one widely circulated labor journal, The Iron Platform, told its readers that

> There is one truth, which should be clearly understood by every workingman in the Union. The slavery of the black man leads to the slavery of the white man. . . . If the doctrine of treason is true, that Capital should own labor, then their logical conclusion is correct, and all laborers, white or black, are and ought to be slaves.[56]

The Free Soil and Republican parties encouraged these sentiments and actively sought labor's sympathy. Both parties adopted free land planks and the Republicans, who presented extension of slavery as a menace to the northern worker, won support from many eastern laborers.

Labor's attitudes in the 1850's were influenced by several factors. With the influx of California gold, the decade was prosperous until the depression in 1857. The enormous railroad and industrial fortunes were accumulated during these years, and the maturation of capitalism showed in the extensive, entrenched factory system as well. Trade unionism flourished too, with dozens of national trade organizations formed by 1857. Workers who belonged to these new organizations were starting to react as a class to powerful, paternalistic employers. The broad reformist, humanitarian programs of the 1830's and the utopian schemes of the 1840's (except for land reform), were discarded. Instead, trade unions concentrated on specific agreements concerning wages, hours and working conditions. Any lingering feelings of harmony between employer and employee were wiped out by this time, and most unions agreed with the National

Typographical Society, which issued this statement in 1850:

> It is useless for us to disguise from ourselves the fact that, under the present arrangement of things, there exists a perpetual antagonism between Labor and Capital . . . one striving to sell their labor for as much, and the other striving to buy it for as little as they can. . . .[57]

The unions that had formed during the 1850's were decimated by the depression of 1857 and the financial slump that followed three years later. Unemployed workers were forced to seek out any available job. Unions were further undermined during the first few months of the Civil War because of their members' enlistment into the army. In fact, it was not unusual for entire unions to enlist at one time, posting "Closed for the duration" notices on union hall walls.[58] Once the orders for war-related supplies reached industry, however, northern workers were in demand, and thus in a strong position to unionize. Industrial production was on the upswing, labor was scarce, and as a New England newspaper noted in 1863, "The workmen of almost every branch of trade have had their strikes within the last few months. . . . In almost every instance the demands of the employed have been acceded to."[59] By the end of the war, 200,000 workers were organized in three hundred locals, and by 1869 twenty-four national unions had been established. Resurgence of unions was out-matched by capitalism's new power, which was founded on the war economy and reinforced by war-related measures. For instance, Civil War banking acts, in addition to helping finance the war, led to "tighter concentration of national credit in the hands of eastern financial institutions."[60] Employers banded together in anti-union organizations, and under the guise of martial law or the federal bill, "Acts to Punish Unlawful

Interference with Employees and Employers," attempted to break unions and halt strikes.[61]

The labor leaders who emerged during and after the Civil War, typified by William Sylvis and Wendell Phillips, sensed an emergent class consciousness and sought to fortify it. As Sylvis succinctly phrased it in an 1864 labor convention address, "There is not only a never-ending conflict between the two classes, but capital is, in all cases, the aggressor." By the war's end Sylvis realized that industry was consolidated, and that with the slavocracy gone, capitalism and labor faced each other without interference. "Our recent war," he said, "has led to the foundation of the most infamous money aristocracy of the earth." Capitalists took "the whole loaf, while labor [was] left to gather the crumbs."[62] Sylvis saw that labor's problems could not now be solved simply through strike action on wage and hour issues. Organization was crucial, but it must aim at a radical program of social change in which benefits accrued to those who produced. In 1866 he and two other unionists formed the National Labor Union (NLU). Sylvis argued for its success because

> Even now a slavery exists in our land worse than ever existed under the old slave system. The center of the slave power no longer exists south of Mason's and Dixon's line. It has been transferred to Wall Street; its vitality is to be found in our huge national bank swindle, and a false monetary system.[63]

The NLU's platform of principles copied the structure and terminology of the Declaration of Independence, adopting most of the preamble verbatim. NLU policy steered would-be strikers into arbitration and encouraged the formation of producers' cooperatives. The union's main political thrust was aimed at achieving money reform and the eight hour day. Sylvis and other unionists felt that the old political parties could not deal with these new issues and they pressed for a national, independent labor party. In 1872, three years after Sylvis' death, the National Labor Reform Party was formed. Dominated by money reformers from its inception, the party eschewed the social reorganization that was the essence of Sylvis' radicalism,[64] and suffered overwhelming defeat in the 1872 elections.

Wendell Phillips was one National Labor Reform candidate whose political aspirations were crushed by the 1872 defeat. Phillips, a radical abolitionist who had been adamant that the causes of abolition and labor not be mixed, was nonetheless sympathetic to labor's problems before he immersed himself in workers' problems during the Civil War. In the 1840's his shock upon seeing firsthand the living and working conditions of the English laboring classes prompted him to deplore the situation in the American press and to lecture on Chartism.[65] He attended the first meeting of the New England Workingmen's Association in 1845 as a delegate, suggesting that political candidates be endorsed only after a thorough grilling on their views concerning labor demands. He supported the public land distribution program of George Henry Evans, as did Gerrit Smith, another influential abolitionist who occasionally allied with labor leaders. Before the war, however, Phillips was unyielding in his decision that abolition take precedence over the problems of free laborers who at least, he pointed out, had recourse to the ballot. In the early 1860's Phillips, like many labor leaders, began to realize that "The hand, representing the power of consolidated wealth, that kept the operative chained to his machine was also the hand that had tried to gag the abolitionists." His interest in the working class increased after the war. In the late seventies he wrote, "While this delusion of peace without purity" lasts, "labor claims every ear and every hand."[66] Phillips formally allied with the NLU on the issue of an eight hour day, the panacea proposed by Ira Steward. Steward felt that increased leisure would mean greater consumerism, which in turn would lead to higher wages. In a speech titled "The Eight-Hour Movement," delivered in 1865, Phillips set the tone for his new involvement: ". . .the struggle for the ownership of labor [the abolition of slavery] is now somewhat near its end; and we fitly commence a struggle to define and to arrange the true relations of capital and labor." Phillips told his audience that they should learn from the experiences of abolition: Be political, but don't dilute your cause by entering traditional political parties. Persistence was another abolitionist quality to be emulated. "You want to make the intellect of the country discuss the question, to make every man speak of it. How did we Antislavery men do this? [A voice, 'Kept at it!'] Yes, kept at it."[67] In an 1871 issue of the National Anti-Slavery Standard (September 9), he implied that abolition's use of morality could be applied to the labor movement: "The only way to accomplish our object is to shame greedy men into humanity. Poison their wealth with the tears and curses of widows and orphans. . . . Let men shrink from them as from slave-dealers. . . ." In an 1871 National Labor Reform Party convention resolution, Phillips voiced one of his most radical beliefs:

> We affirm, as a fundamental principle, that labor, the creator of wealth, is entitled to all it creates. Affirming this, we avow ourselves willing to accept the final results of the operation of a principle so radical, such as the overthrow of the whole profit-making system.

Wendell even admitted that he favored an "equalization of property" and, during the same year, was publicly sympathetic to the Paris Commune. Despite his radical rhetoric, however, his specific labor proposals were reformist, and he envisioned an eventual labor situation that would offer opportunities for advancement in status and pay. As well, Phillips was tenaciously persistent in his belief that the problems of America, including her working class, would not be solved through revolution, but by means of the ballot box.[68]

Phillips' faith in the ballot compelled him to accept the National Labor Reform Party's nomination as governor of Massachusetts in 1872. The campaign, he correctly foresaw, would not be a political success, but he planned to use the occasion as a convenient platform for his ideas. By 1872, however, Phillips was switching his allegiance from the eight hour movement to Greenbackism. Although that movement failed nationally, Phillips was attracted by the pro-freedmen policies of the Massachusetts Greenback candidates, and hoped that a pro-black, pro-labor Greenback party would prove to be the political coalition of the future.[69]

iii

Phillips was virtually alone among old-guard abolitionists in his involvement with labor. Theodore Parker, a potential postwar labor activist, died in 1860. Gerrit Smith warmed to labor's problems during his terms in Congress, and several minor abolitionists, such as George McNeill, who became a staunch trade-unionist during the Gilded Age, embraced the cause of the wage slave. Likewise, few legitimate labor leaders actively supported abolition. William Leggett, co-editor of the Working Man's Advocate and a prominent New York labor spokesman, was the most notable exception. Many utopians who allied with the labor movement in the 1840's supported emancipation and opposed slavery, but were not orthodox abolitionists. Separation of labor and abolition was caused not by a lack of sympathy for each other's goals, but by a difference in underlying philosophy. The National Anti-Slavery Standard wrote to the Harbinger (Harbinger, October 30, 1847) that abolition, because "it asserts the natural equality of all men," had to be the basis for other reforms. "Social reform . . . must begin with the greatest social evil. . . . [Abolition accomplished], we have a foundation whereupon to build a social reorganization." Labor, before its nearly uniform support of non-extension in the 1850's, was fundamentally suspicious of any solution which did not deal directly and exclusively with its own problems. Although the issue of slavery in the territories increasingly absorbed labor's interest, the alliance was not completely inimical to the labor movement. This was recognized by most labor leaders and workingmen's journals, which believed that free and slave labor could not and must not coexist.

The free interchange of leaders that characterized relations between abolition and movements such as temperance and woman's rights was not evident between labor and abolition. Early labor organizations were, however, like abolition, part of antebellum humanitarianism. Beginning in the 1830's, labor leaders referred to "the powerful and inhuman grasp of monopolized wealth,"[70] an attitude that persisted long after workers moved beyond organizing for simple charitable purposes. Labor leaders were also imbued with an optimistic, romantic faith in the future. "Domination of the poor by the rich," says one labor historian, "was believed to be a violation of natural rights and the natural order, which would triumph in the end."[71] Labor's ideological foundations, judging from the newspapers and speeches of the 1830's to the NLU platform in 1868, were grounded in the ideals of the Declaration of Independence. Labor, like abolition, wanted re-definition of the ideals of liberty and equality; and, like abolition, the labor movement vacillated between radical and moderate, reformist tactics for achieving those goals. Radical reorganization of society as a solution for labor's problems was a concept consistently considered, and consistently rejected. Even independent political action, which might have provided a stable base for more radical economic and social reform, was doomed by the partial acquiescence of existing political parties to labor's reformist demands. With their most pressing problems thus solved, labor's developing ideologies and emerging class conscious attitudes were undercut, or diverted back into the traditional political and social structures. Labor's third party experience was not unlike that of abolition: independent political action was useless without a broad political appeal, and in order to muster votes, original goals had to be compromised.

Organizational structure of both abolition and the labor movement reflected the era's penchant for society-forming. Local unions were the mainstay of the national trade organizations, surviving most economic crises as their national counterparts floundered. Locals also organized themselves as abolition, temperance, and mutual aid societies. National leaders in both movements, like Sylvis and Weld, stayed in contact with their grass-roots organizations by means of the lecture circuit. Many labor leaders also adopted the urgent, strident rhetoric used by abolitionists to emphasize their cause, and trade unions, when not undermined by depressions, were as strong and aggressive as abolition's organizations.

The labor movement was also affected by revivalist ideas. Labor evangelism, with origins in the Christian perfectionism of Charles Finney, denounced the new industrial order as contrary to the will of God. Economic tenets of the Gilded Age, such as sanction of laissez-faire capitalism, belief that business practices could be divorced from the restraints of Christian morality, the Calvinistic equation of poverty with sinfulness, and the Malthusian doctrine that famine and disease were the only checks on population growth, were all refuted on the basis of Finney's doctrine that man's progress was directed by a benevolent God. In an 1865 speech, William Sylvis summarized the ideas of Malthus, who believed that because populations naturally increased "beyond the means of subsistence," the "constant effort" to "increase and multiply . . . tends to subject the lower classes of society to distress, and to prevent any great permanent amelioration in their condition. . . . Honest industry leads to starvation. Licentiousness and crime, robbery and murder, tend to render the supply of food abundant." Sylvis answered that

> If man was guided solely by the natural laws under which he was created and designed to live, multiplication would unquestionably be much more rapid than it now is: but is it not reasonable, is it not Christian, to suppose that the all-wise Being who placed us here, and whose attributes are benevolence and love, could find other means of controlling population than war, famine, pestilence, and crime in all its forms?[72]

Several modern historians have suggested that the radically new patterns of life and work forced by the industrial boom caused men to cling to the "preindustrial custom and religion" molded by the revivalists. A social Christianity, predating the late nineteenth century Social Gospel, sanctioned organized labor. The sentiments of "radical criticism and labor discontent [were] sanctioned by an appeal to Christian tradition. . . ."[73] Sylvis insisted that America's distinctiveness was grounded in "God's ordained equality of man . . . recognized in the laws and institutions of our country."[74] Other postwar labor leaders, including abolitionist and trade unionist George McNeill, had faith in the supremacy of "moral power" and anticipated perfection in this world.[75] Labor historian Herbert Gutman has proposed that evangelical Protestantism was a strong link between the antebellum and post-Civil War laborers: "Vital in both pre-Civil War reform movements and evangelical crusades," says Gutman, "perfectionist Christianity carried over into the Gilded Age and offered the uprooted but discontented Protestant worker ties with the certainties of his past and reasons for his disaffection with the present. . . ."[76]

Jesse Jones was one postwar Christian perfectionist who was regarded by his contemporaries and by modern historians as an anachronistic outcropping of the antebellum era. Reverend Jones, an advocate of Christian communism, wielded little influence during his active years in the 1870's, but his reputation and quixotic exploits were resurrected later in the century when Christian labor reform became popular. Outraged by the coexistence of "money kings" and slums, Jones preached that the kingdom of Heaven would be realized on earth -- and be based on common property. Jones went a step beyond his antebellum predecessors who believed that American democracy was sanctioned by God. Citing his country's glorious revolutionary traditions and ideals, the Congregationalist minister proposed that God intended his earthly kingdom to flourish in America. Or, as he succinctly put it in title form, "The United States of America -- Is The Kingdom of God Which Jesus Christ Came To Establish Upon The Earth."[77] In 1872 Jones founded the Christian Labor Union, headquartered in Boston. Supported by a small group of like-minded people, including George McNeill, Jones' working assumption was that American Protestantism had so concentrated on the "work in the heart of the individual that the coordinate and equally essential work of reorganizing society has first been lost sight of and then denied." As a result, asserted Jones, "our business system is pagan in origin, selfish in nature, and the deadly foe of Christianity." Humanitarian in its central thrust, the scope of the Christian Labor Union encompassed relief for the poor and unemployed, and a variety of economic reforms based on Biblical precedent. Jones and his followers urged the church to move beyond the saving of individual souls to the reshaping of society, "that other and equally essential work of Jesus."[78] Jones not only echoed Finney's perfectionism and the transcendentalist-Unitarian view that social reform must proceed through "self-cultured" individuals, but foreshadowed as well the later social gospellers.

One of Jones' followers, abolitionist George McNeill, was later involved with the Christian socialist Church of the Carpenter pastored by William Bliss. Bliss, in his work with the major labor organizations of the day and in his religiously-oriented social reform projects, tried to philosophically and actively reconcile socialism and Christianity. A member of the Knights of Labor and a proselytizing agent for the Christian Socialist Union, Bliss included among his coterie such luminaries as Vida Scudder, Edward Bellamy, Henry George and William Dean Howells.[79] His friend McNeill was an American Federation of Labor organizer as well as a member of Bliss' fabian-oriented congregation. In his 1887 book, The Labor Movement, McNeill blended the antebellum hallmarks of evangelicism, humanitarianism and Christian brotherhood with the Social Gospel message of the Progressive period. He concluded this first history of American labor movements with this statement:

> When the Golden Rule of Christ shall measure the relations of men in all their duties towards their fellows, in factory and work-shop, in the mine, in the field, in commerce . . . the promise of the prophet and the poet shall be fulfilled . . . and peace on earth shall prevail . . . by the free acceptance of the Gospel that all men are of one blood.[80]

The early labor movement in America was thus part of the general antebellum humanitarian movement that was grounded in the revolutionary ideology and motivated by evangelical Protestantism, Romanticism, and an optimistic faith in progress. Not only did its ideological origins reach back to the American Revolution, but it was also a movement that continued after the Civil War without shedding all its antebellum characteristics. Rapid growth of the early labor movement was stunted by several factors, including the existence of slavery, the deadening effects of depressions and unfavorable legal decisions. Although it was not incorporated into abolition, an alliance sought after by some labor leaders, labor's ideology and tactics were molded by its interaction with the abolition movement.

In 1832, as immediate abolition was claiming the public's attention, two-thirds of all New York was unionized, with other industrial centers also well organized during those prosperous years. Even during the years 1845-1861, when workers supported non-extension and utopian schemes claimed attention, labor organization was expanding and its philosophy taking shape. Despite the upheaval of the Civil War and Reconstruction, unions flourished from 1861-1870, a strong indicator that the abolition movement had not absorbed all labor's energies. Although some labor advocates, notably utopians, constantly pressed for an alliance with the abolitionists, many other labor leaders did not. Despite their sympathetic attitude toward the goal of emancipation and their belief that all American laborers were oppressed, many legitimate labor spokesmen actively sought to maintain the independence of their movement. The two movements were based on a common ideological tradition and had sprung from similar motivations;

yet a significant segment of the workingman's movement retained a unique identity. Existence of slavery, however, was increasingly recognized as inimical to the labor movement's growth, and as William Sylvis noted, the post-Civil War period meant that free labor at last had the opportunity to unite on a truly national basis.[81]

NOTES: CHAPTER II

[1] John R. Commons et al., *History of Labour in the United States*, 4 vols. (New York, 1936), 1: 15. Only volume 1 was consulted for this thesis, and all subsequent notes on Commons refer to this volume. In this study the terms "worker" and "American labor" are defined as urban wage earners. This definition is intentionally general and includes skilled craftsmen, mechanics, and semi-skilled or unskilled day laborers. When a particular group or specific craft is referred to, a more descriptive term will be used. It should be noted that in antebellum usage a general term such as "worker" or "the laboring class" included workingmen (apprentices or casual laborers without a trade), mechanics, *and* farmers. See, for instance, Seth Luther, "An Address to the Working-Men of New-England" (Boston, 1832), p. 32, reprinted in Leon Stein and Philip Taft, eds., *Religion, Reform, and Revolution: Labor Panaceas in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1969). Joseph Tuckerman, in "An Essay on the Wages Paid to Females for their Labour" (Philadelphia, 1830), p. 8, also defines the term wage earner. His essay is included in Stein and Taft's book. Two modern historians who briefly explain the history of labor terminology are Commons, pp. 7-8 and pp. 14-15, and Bernard Mandel, *Labor: Free and Slave: Workingmen and the Anti-Slavery Movement in the United States* (New York, 1955), p. 13.

[2] Ibid., pp. 7-8. Commons discusses the separation of wage earners (as a class) from the master craftsmen and merchant capitalists on p. 12. Several modern historians recognize the antebellum emergence of wage earners as a class. David Montgomery, "The Working Classes of the Pre-Industrial American City, 1790-1830," *Labor History* 9 (1968): 7, says that "By the 1820's . . . the urban working classes comprised recognizable and self-conscious elements of urban society." Ostrander, in *Rights of Man in America*, p. 301, concludes that skilled artisans and mechanics were a cohesive group by the 1850's. He says that "During the fifties skilled labor organized, not, as formerly, to promote general programs of reform, but rather as permanent members of a class, joined together to better their working conditions in the inevitable struggle against capital." Mandel, in *Labor: Free and Slave*, p. 21, feels that the antebellum "working class" was "class-conscious . . . in so far as economic struggles were concerned" -- without espousing revolutionary goals. "The Northern working class," he continues on p. 61, compared to "its Southern counterpart," was "much larger, stronger, and more concentrated, and had developed a higher degree of class-consciousness." Herman Schluter, *Lincoln, Labor and Slavery: A Chapter from the Social History of America* (New York, 1965), p. 34, believes that the antebellum period witnessed "the rise of capitalist industry in the North and the concomitant growth of an industrial working class with separate class interests and separate class feelings. . . ." Joseph G. Rayback, in "The American Workingman and The Antislavery Crusade," *Journal of Economic History* 3 (1943): 155, also speaks of "an awakened class consciousness" by 1850.

[3] See p. 18, n. 5, above. Commons, ibid., p. 12, terms the post-depression years of 1837-1850 the "humanitarian" phase of the labor movement. Commons' thesis regarding the relationship between the labor movement and abolition is similar to Tyler's and Craven's. Commons, however, notes several other factors involved in this process of absorption: "The panic of 1837 brought to a sudden stop these aggressions [trade unionism of the 1830's], and, for the next dozen years we find the most astonishing junction of humanitarianism, bizarre reforms and utopias, protective tariffs and futile labor legislation. . . . Swallowed, as these were in the rising prices of the gold discoveries and in the anti-slavery agitation, . . . this *humanitarian* period slipped away into a second trade union period of the middle of the decade of the fifties, scarcely noticed beneath the absorbing premonitions of civil war."

[4] Ekirch, *The Idea of Progress*, p. 131. Also see Curti, *Growth of American Thought*, p. 371. On ethnic divisions within the labor movements see Mandel, *Labor: Free and Slave*, p. 22 and Ash, *Social Movements in America*, p. 40. Riegel, *Young America*, pp. 138-140 and Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, pp. 213-214, discuss both the legal impediments to labor organization and the effects of depressions.

[5] Riegel, *Young America*, p. 147. The preceding quote can be found in Montgomery, "Working Classes," p. 5. On pp. 5-6 Montgomery lists those who rose from the ranks of the early trade unions to become masters or merchants. R. Laurence Moore, ed., *The Emergence of an American Left: Civil War to World War I* (New York, 1973), p. 5, discusses those groups of Americans who "rejected the rhetoric of class struggle as inimical to brotherhood."

[6] For data supporting the assertion that industrial growth began in 1830, see Montgomery, "Working Classes," p. 3, or Branch, *Sentimental Years*, pp. 12-14. Numerous historians describe the era's social dislocation. Consult Branch, pp. 40-45; Ash, *Social Movements in America*, chap. 4; and Rozwenc, *Making of American Society*, 1: 355-365. Ostrander, *Rights of Man in America*, p. 296, notes that "Most of the main problems arising out of the industrial revolution which beset American society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were faced for the first time during the generation which preceded the Civil War." It should be noted as well that this thesis will deal only with the relationship between abolition and northern workers. For an introduction to the problems concerning free labor in the South, see Mandel, *Labor: Free and Slave*, chap. 2.

[7] More detailed histories of the earliest strikes and labor associations can be found in the general labor studies such as Commons, *History of Labour in the United States*, parts 1-3, or Philip Taft, *Organized Labor in American History* (New York, 1964), chaps. 1-3. Most social histories of antebellum America deal with the labor movement, if only in relation to social utopianism. An old but still useful study on this topic is McMaster, *Acquisition of Political, Social and Industrial Rights*, especially pp. 54-61 and pp. 96-111.

[8] From the Democratic Press (Philadelphia), June 14, 1827, quoted in Taft, Organized Labor in American History, p. 14.

[9] The preamble to the Mechanics' Union of Trade Associations' 1828 constitution, quoted in ibid., p. 15. The Mechanics' Union folded at the end of 1828, "an obvious victim," Taft says, "of the political malady."

[10] The Mechanics Free Press, August 16, 1828, quoted in ibid., pp. 16-17.

[11] Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 74.

[12] Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, pp. 214-215. Lien laws are defined in Joseph G. Rayback, A History of American Labor (New York, 1959), p. 66. Commons, History of Labour in the United States, p. 12, believes that these demands were "individualistic measures which assert the rights of persons against rights of property." This desire for full and equal personal rights is evident in the consistent citing of the Declaration of Independence by early labor groups. See n. 23, below, and pp. 7-9, above, regarding the unresolved tension between property versus personal rights in the Declaration of Independence.

[13] Part of a publication of the Working Men's Republican Political Association of Penn Township, Pennsylvania, quoted in Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 74.

[14] Quoted in Commons, History of Labour in the United States, p. 285. The previous quote, from the Newark Village Chronicle (May, 1830), is also reprinted on p. 285. Tyler, in Freedom's Ferment, p. 214, states that workingmen believed in the Declaration of Independence and saw their only hope for equality in universal manhood suffrage. For similar statements, see Montgomery, "Working Classes," p. 13 and Gutman, "Protestantism and the American Labor Movement: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age," p. 80.

[15] Seth Luther, "An Address to the Working-Men of New-England," p. 32, reprinted in Stein and Taft, Religion, Reform, and Revolution.

[16] From the Columbian Centennial (Boston), February 15, 1832, quoted in Taft, Organized Labor in American History, p. 19.

[17] Ash, Social Movements in America, p. 87. The period from 1828-1831 was one of economic depression, causing employers to lengthen hours or cut pay. From 1833 until the 1837 panic, strikes for shorter hours and increased pay were generally successful.

[18] Lens, Radicalism in America, pp. 77-79. The New York Workingman's Party platform is reprinted in McMaster, Aquisition of Political, Social and Industrial Rights, pp. 100-101.

[19] Riegel, Young America, pp. 146-147. For a discussion of Owenism see Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, chap. 9, or Ekirch, The Idea of Progress, pp. 132-136, where Wright's ideas of progress and Owen's attitude toward machines are examined. Wright's 1830 "Address to the Industrious Classes; A Sketch of a System of National Education" and Owen's 1830 "Address to the Conductors of the New-York Periodical Press" are reprinted in Stein and Taft, Religion, Reform, and Revolution.

[20] See Wright's "Address to the Industrious Classes; A Sketch of a System of National Education," reprinted in Stein and Taft, Religion, Reform, and Revolution. Wright's assertion concerning class war is quoted in Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 78.

[21] Quoted in Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 79. Owen and Wright were Scottish, and Evans was British. Such zenophobic comments were common, reflecting the nation's growing nativism, which culminated in the 1852 Know-Nothing party. Several other radical segments of the population, such as the German-Americans, or other individual radical labor leaders were foreign, a fact which some historians cite as an additional impediment to early acceptance in America of more radical labor ideas or ideologies. McMaster, Acquisition of Political, Social and Industrial Rights, pp. 103-105 quotes extensively from the conservative newspaper reaction to the radical New York Workingman's Party.

[22] Taft, Organized Labor in American History, pp. 19-20, amplifies this point.

[23] Moore was the first labor leader elected to Congress. In his maiden speech in the House of Representatives, he called for "government founded on persons, and not on property; on equal rights, and not on exclusive privilege." Quoted in Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 85.

[24] Taft, Organized Labor in American History, pp. 20-28 and Edward Pessen, "The Workingmen's Movement of the Jacksonian Era," MVHR 43 (1956): 432-435. Several leaders of the city-wide trade associations based their programs on the ideals of freedom and equality. See Ekirch, The Idea of Progress, pp. 136-138. The National Trades' Union, though it folded shortly before the panic of 1837, gave rise to many separate trade organizations of national scope.

[25] The preceding discussion of locofocoism and the Equal Rights Party follows Walter Hugins, Jacksonian Democracy and the Working Class: A Study of the New York Workingmen's Movement, 1829-1837 (Stanford, Calif., 1960), chap. 3.

[26] Quoted in Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 88. The brackets are Lens'. The previous quote is located on the same page, and the leaflet referred to has no known author.

[27] Quoted in ibid., p. 85. The statement was made by William Leggett, a labor leader and co-editor of the *Working Man's Advocate*. Lens explains in chap. 6, p. 85, that the Equal Rights Party was "the answer to the twin menace of bank and machine. . . ." The national Bank was viewed by workers as the bastion of aristocratic financial power. And according to a trade union leader, machinery in 1835 was used "for the benefit of the few," and not for "the mass," (quoted on p. 84). This polarization between rich and poor is also evident in an 1834 election song sung by New York City workingmen during a mayoral race: "Mechanics, cartmen, laborers/ must form a close connection,/ And show the rich Aristocrats,/ Their powers at this election." The song is quoted on p. 83.

[28] Quoted in ibid., pp. 88-89. The newspaper quoted from in ibid., pp. 88-89, is the *Union*, published under the auspices of the New York General Trades' Union.

[29] See ibid., p. 90, and Ash, *Social Movements in America*, pp. 86-87. Lens and Ash stress that Equal Rights accepted capitalism and the employer-employee relationship, and were primarily concerned with improving the existing relationships.

[30] See, for instance, Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, p. 216. Edward B. Mittelman, in Commons, *History of Labour in the United States*, p. 456, says that "With the first descent of the panic in 1837, the labour movement was crushed out of existence."

[31] Branch, *Sentimental Years*, p. 70. The figures on factory closings and bankruptcies can be found in Harvey Wish, *Society and Thought in America*, 2 vols. (New York, 1950), vol. 1: *Society and Thought in Early America: A Social and Intellectual History of the American People Through 1865*, p. 400.

[32] Ibid., p. 70-71.

[33] Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, chaps. 8 and 9, discusses religious and social utopianism, including Fourier's philosophy. Ekirch, *The Idea of Progress*, looks at utopianism in terms of the American belief in progress. Many historians assert that the labor movement was influenced by these social philosophies during the 1840's, including Ash, *Social Movements in America*, pp. 90-93, and Foster R. Dulles, *Labor In America*, 3d ed. (New York, 1960), p. 80. Taft, *Organized Labor in American History*, chap. 4, emphasizes that social utopianism had its greatest affect on labor leaders, and not on the rank and file workers. Henry E. Hoagland, in Commons, *History of Labour in the United States*, discusses the humanitarian phase of labor in part 4.

[34] See Schluter, *Lincoln, Labor and Slavery*, chap. 2, "The Workingmen and Chattel Slavery," for a discussion of the correspondence between West and Garrison. This exchange not only helped West to clarify his ideas, but also provided a new public forum for nascent labor ideology.

[35] Henry Steele Commager, Theodore Parker: Yankee Crusader, 2d ed., (Boston, 1947), p. 184 and p. 181. Tyler, in Freedom's Ferment, p. 62, notes that Parker was one of the first ministers to allow women to preach from his pulpit. Tyler calls Parker's Christian practices "socialized religion." She points out on p. 63 that Parker felt that "prison reform, prevention of vice and crime, labor problems, the peace movement, educational reforms, temperance, abolition . . . [were all] parts of a common whole." Samuel Gridley Howe, another abolitionist who considered his reform work "practical religion," also embodied this idea that "perfectibility and social responsibility [must reinforce] each other." See Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 688. The concept endured, and reappeared in the Social Gospel.

[36] The discussion of the abolitionist appeal to northern labor follows Williston H. Lofton, "Abolition and Labor," JNH 33 (1948): 249-261.

[37] See ibid., pp. 250-251, and Herman Schluter, Lincoln, Labor and Slavery, pp. 52-55.

[38] From an 1836 Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Society publication, quoted in ibid., p. 253. Also see p. 254, which contains quotes by other antislavery societies expressing similar sentiments.

[39] Ibid., p. 255. Birney's arguments can be found on pp. 255-256. His ideas were supported by Senator Niles of Connecticut. See pp. 256-257.

[40] Quoted from the Liberator, May 8, 1846, in ibid., p. 257.

[41] Quoted from the National Era, July 24, 1851, in ibid., p. 259.

[42] Rayback, "The American Workingman and the Antislavery Crusade," pp. 156-157.

[43] Quoted in ibid., p. 154. Rayback says that this "widely circulated pamphlet" was written c. 1850 by H. F. James. The rhetoric adopted by some labor advocates was often as vituperative as that of the abolitionists. For another example, see the address by Mathew Carey, "Appeal to the Rich," reprinted in the Liberator, January 1, 1831, and in Stein and Taft, Religion, Reform, and Revolution.

[44] See ibid., p. 155, or Lofton, "Abolition and Labor," p. 276.

[45] This idea is expressed in Rayback, "The American Workingman and the Antislavery Crusade," p. 155. Also see n. 2, above.

[46] Quoted in Lofton, "Abolition and Labor," p. 265. See several similar quotes from the labor press, pp. 265-266.

[47] Quoted in the Harbinger, June 26, 1847. Young America was the new (1845) title of the Working Man's Advocate. Also see the article, "White Slavery," reprinted in the July 17, 1847 Harbinger.

[48] Quoted in Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 106. Also see the comments on white slavery by George Henry Evans, quoted in Rayback, "The American Workingman and the Antislavery Crusade," pp. 155-156. W. E. Channing's famous retort to such arguments was that "misery is not slavery."

[49] See Ryckman's "Address to the Workingmen of the Northeast," in the Harbinger, June 21, 1845. William West and Horace Greeley also supported this broad definition of slavery.

[50] The Friend of Man, quoted in Lofton, "Abolition and Labor," p. 277.

[51] See ibid., pp. 277-279, Rayback, "The American Workingman and the Antislavery Crusade," pp. 158-161, and Mandel, Labor: Free and Slave, pp. 70-76.

[52] Lofton, "Abolition and Labor," p. 276. The fact that labor support of abolition mushroomed with emergence of the non-extension issue is recognized also by Rayback, Lens, Ash, and Mandel.

[53] Quoted in Lens, Radicalism in America, p. 118.

[54] Quoted from the Voice of Industry (February 9, 1847), in Lofton, "Abolition and Labor," p. 281.

[55] Mandel, Labor: Free and Slave, p. 134. The positions of labor newspapers on the non-extension issue are discussed in Rayback, "The American Workingman and the Antislavery Crusade," p. 161. Rayback notes that most labor journals actively supported Free Soil in 1848, and condemned the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. On attitudes of German-Americans, see Lofton, ibid., p. 282; Lens, Radicalism in America, pp. 118-119; and Mandel, p. 167, who says that by 1860 most German-Americans voted Republican.

[56] Quoted in ibid., pp. 199-200. Mandel discusses specific pamphlets which favored the war on p. 200f.

[57] See Ostrander, Rights of Man in America, p. 301, where the statement from the National Typographical Society is reprinted. Henry E. Hoagland, in Commons, History of Labour in the United States, deals with 1850's trade unionism in chap. 7. Hoagland states that recession was evident from 1855-1862, and that employers banded together to prevent unions from forcing wage increases, p. 605.

[58] Quoted in Mandel, Labor: Free and Slave, p. 180.

[59] Quoted in Lens, *Radicalism in America*, p. 131. Wages, he adds, never kept up with the 76 percent cost of living increase between 1860-1865. The discussion of labor organization during and after the war is based on Schluter, *Lincoln, Labor and Slavery*, chap. 7; ibid. chaps. 5 and 6; and Lens, chaps. 5-8.

[60] Ostrander, *Rights of Man in America*, p. 304.

[61] Schluter, *Lincoln, Labor and Slavery*, pp. 214-215. Schluter also describes the 1863 New York draft riots, which began as a protest against the $300 exemption fee and ended as anti-black riots, pp. 202-210.

[62] Quoted in Lens, *Radicalism in America*, p. 135. The previous quote is from Sylvis, *Life and Speeches of William H. Sylvis*, p. 101.

[63] Sylvis, *Life and Speeches of William H. Sylvis*, p. 82. The NLU platform is reprinted on pp. 284-295.

[64] Moore, *Emergence of an American Left*, pp. 1-13, examines Sylvis and the post-war labor movement in terms of Marxism. Sylvis wanted the NLU to affiliate with the First International, but "had no desire to overturn capitalism," p. 13.

[65] See the *Harbinger*, July 17, 1847. The discussion of Wendell Phillips' labor views is based on Irving Bartlett, *Wendell Phillips: Brahmin Radical* (Boston, 1967), chaps. 17-21 (especially chap. 19 on "Labor Reform"), and on Phillips' labor speeches in Wendell Phillips, *Speeches, Lectures, and Letters*, 2d ser. (Boston, 1891).

[66] Wendell Phillips, "The Outlook," *North American Review* July, 1878, p. 115, quoted in Bartlett, *Wendell Phillips*, p. 336. The preceding quote can be found on p. 339, and is Bartlett's.

[67] Phillips, *Speeches, Lectures, and Letters*, 2d ser., pp. 141-142. The preceding quote can be found on p. 139. The brackets are not mine, but were inserted in the published version of the speech.

[68] Wendell Phillips, the *National Labor Reform Platform*, p. 154, and "The Foundation of the Labor Movement," 1871, p. 163, both reprinted in Stein and Taft, *Religion, Reform, and Revolution*. Phillips says on p. 163, "That's the meaning of the Labor movement, -- an equalization of property." Also see Bartlett, *Wendell Phillips*, pp. 345-346, and p. 348. Bartlett quotes Phillips' ideas on compulsory arbitration, p. 349, and discusses the 1872 election on pp. 355-356.

[69] Bartlett, *Wendell Phillips*, p. 363.

[70] Seth Luther, "An Address to the Working-Men of New-England," p. 6, reprinted in Stein and Taft, Religion, Reform, and Revolution.

[71] Pessen, "Workingmen's Movement in the Jacksonian Era," p. 437. Gutman, in "Protestantism and American Labor: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age," p. 94, echoes Lois Banner's thesis that reforms were manned by youths. Says Gutman, "Scattered . . . evidence hints at an apparent close connection between youthful religious conversion and subsequent labor militancy among certain workers."

[72] The quotes from Malthus can be found in Sylvis, Life and Speeches of William H. Sylvis, p. 160. Sylvis' rebuttal is on p. 162. The section of his speech which deals with these issues covers pp. 159-164. Joseph Tuckerman also argued against Malthus in his 1830 "Essay on the Wages Paid to Females for their Labour," reprinted in Stein and Taft, Religion, Reform, and Revolution.

[73] Gutman, "Protestantism and American Labor: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age," p. 82. Also see pp. 181-184 below, which deal with the continuity between evangelicism and the Social Gospel.

[74] William Sylvis, "The Aristocracy of Intellect," in Sylvis, Life and Speeches of William H. Sylvis, p. 445.

[75] McNeill and other labor leaders are discussed in Gutman, "Protestantism and American Labor: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age," pp. 89-94.

[76] Ibid., p. 96. The historians who share Gutman's views, Henry May, Timothy Smith and E. J. Hobsbawm, are discussed, respectively, on p. 76, pp. 79 and 83, and p. 79.

[77] Jesse Jones, The Kingdom of Heaven (Boston, 1871), opposite p. 214, quoted in Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York, 1949), p. 76. My treatment of Jones is based primarily on May, pp. 74-79, and Charles Howard Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven, Conn., 1940), pp. 42-49 and pp. 145-146. Jones is also analysed by Fredrickson, Inner Civil War, p. 197, where the author states that Jones was a "living link between Civil War millenialism and the Social Gospel movement." May and Hopkins, on the other hand, feel that the true predecessors of the Social Gospel were preachers like Henry Beecher and Horace Bushnell, who humanized the old orthodoxy. Ralph Henry Gabriel, in chap. 20 of The Course of American Democratic Thought, 2d ed. (New York, 1940), sees Jones as an early Marxist, and posits that his communistic plans were akin to antebellum Fourierism.

[78] Jesse Jones, in Equity: A Journal of Christian Labor Reform, June, 1875, quoted in Hopkins, Rise of the Social Gospel, p. 47. The two previous quotes are on p. 45, and are from an 1874 issue of Equity.

Hopkins calls the Christian Labor Union "the earliest-known American organization dedicated to the propagation of social-gospel principles," p. 42.

[79] Bliss is dealt with in ibid., pp. 282-289; in May, Protestant Churches, pp. 241-247; and in Gabriel, The Course of American Democratic Thought, chap. 20. Bliss was a co-founder of the Church Association for the Advancement of the Interests of Labor (better known by its acronym, CAIL). Organized in 1887, CAIL's active support of the labor movement was grounded in its belief that "the chief of man's God-given rights is the right to work," Gabriel, p. 264.

[80] George McNeill, The Labor Movement: The Problem Today (Boston, 1887), pp. 468-469.

[81] Figures on labor organization in 1832 can be found in Furnas, The Americans, p. 454. Statistics on labor organization during 1860-1869 are in Taft, Organized Labor in American History, chap. 5. Sylvis' attempts at international labor cooperation and at cooperation between black and white labor are related in Mandel, Labor: Free and Slave, pp. 210-216.

CHAPTER III

Abolition and Woman's Rights: Emancipation of the "True Woman"

i

The American movement for woman's rights peaked during the age of reform in the late nineteenth century. Associated primarily with the issues of suffrage and woman's social role, the movement was led, until the turn of the century, by the famous triumverate of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony and Lucy Stone. The acknowledged beginning of the woman's movement is the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention, with the next organizational milestone trailing by twenty-one years. The 1869 formation of the radically oriented National Woman's Suffrage Association (NWSA) was counterbalanced the following year by formation of another, more conservative organization, christened the American Woman's Suffrage Association (AWSA). The appearance of such organizations is usually a function of a developing ideology or an outgrowth of cultural ferment, and these woman's rights associations were no exception. Preceding the Seneca Falls meeting were two tumultuous decades during which women began to move from their accepted "sphere" of home and church into the era's major reform societies, onto the lecture platform, and into the working force. Between 1828 and 1848 an advanced guard of educated women formulated arguments aimed at removing the existing social, economic, and political limitations which confined American women to certain stereotyped roles. During the antebellum era women began to write, speak and act in new, socially unacceptable ways, and at the same time they forged an ideology to support the emerging order.[1]

It was the abolition movement, despite the potency of its own appeal, which provided the immediate motivation to the early woman's rights movement. Women began forming local abolition societies during the 1830's, and by mid-decade half of the 100,000 abolitionist members were women.[2] Although female abolitionist organizations were most often auxiliaries of the male-dominated state or city societies, women were also effective within the AASS. Also, at the national level, women such as Angelina Grimke and Lucy Stone were prominent abolitionist lecturers in their own right. Not only did women learn the mechanics of society-forming through participation in abolition, but they also absorbed ideological lessons. By advocating the emancipation of the Negro on the grounds of human rights, for instance, women soon applied that rationale to the struggle for their own rights. One fundamental feminist assumption was that all people were part of the human family, and that reform based upon human rights should consequently aim at ameliorating the inequitous situation of women.[3] During 1831 Angelina Grimke maintained a well publicized correspondence on the issues of slavery and abolition with the conservative Catherine Beecher, daughter of preacher Lyman Beecher. In trying to enlighten the recalcitrant Catherine concerning the general principle of human rights, Grimke wrote her that

> The investigation of the rights of the slave has led me to a better understanding of my own. I have found the Anti-Slavery cause to be the high school of morals in our land --

> the school in which human rights are more fully investigated, and better understood and taught, than in any other. Here a great fundamental principle is uplifted and illuminated, and from this central light, rays innumerable stream all around. Human beings have rights, because they are moral beings: the rights of all men grow out of their moral nature; and as all men have the same moral nature, they have essentially the same rights. These rights may be [wrested from a person], but they cannot be alienated.[4]

Echoing the abolitionists, women also claimed their rights on the basis of the Declaration of Independence, arguing for instance that

> We must come back to the good old doctrine of our forefathers who declared to the world, 'this self-evident truth that all men are created equal, and that they have certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'[5]

Dr. Harriot Hunt, who publicly protested her tax levy each year, reasserted the familiar grievance that, "Taxation without representation is tyranny."[6] The English traveller Harriet Martineau, perceptive observer of the American social scene, remarked that

> One of the fundamental principles announced in the Declaration of Independence is, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. How can the political condition of women be reconciled with this?[7]

The abolition movement thus provided a catalytic ideological milieu as well as a period of apprenticeship during which women became acquainted with the mechanics of running a large organization.

In the mid-1830's, when female abolitionists first shifted their attention to the rights of women, the reaction of their colleagues was mixed. Some thought woman's rights a frivolous or selfish issue; others, like Theodore Weld, felt that a premature demand for woman's rights, despite the justice of the cause, would detract from the abolition movement. The Garrisonians, along with many radical abolitionists, believed not only that the two causes were ideologically compatible, but also that woman's rights should claim the active support of abolitionists.[8]

Despite its close ties with abolition, and despite the growing popularity of anti-slavery in the 1840's and 1850's, the nascent woman's rights movement was not swallowed up by the ever-increasing abolitionist agitation. During the 1830's when Angelina and Sarah Grimke first linked the two causes, they did so as abolitionists asserting their ostensible right to lecture in public.[9] Not only did abolition supply the occasion for this important assertion of equality, but it also supplied the inchoate woman's movement with organizational experience and ideology. Further, the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention was the long-term result of the rejection of female delegates by the 1840 World's Anti-Slavery Convention (WASC). And in the years before the Civil War, in spite of the sharpened focus on the questions of slavery and abolition, women achieved important legal reforms and initiated their first national conventions. During the war itself, however, women suspended their own organizational apparatus in order to concentrate on winning the war and freeing southern slaves. Many women hoped that if slaves were freed and granted their civil rights, the political rights of women would be secured as well. This dual emancipation was not realized, a bitter disappointment to many. But despite this setback the woman's rights movement resurfaced after the war to renew demands for equality and suffrage. Even during the thirty years of agitation preceding the nineteenth Amendment, in spite of changes in leadership, philosophy and tactics, the woman's suffrage movement retained many of its antebellum underpinnings.

ii

On the Fourth of July in 1828, a Scotswoman lectured in a large hall to a "mixed" American audience. Public sensibilities were outraged. Not only was the open platform no place for a true woman, but for a female to address an audience that included men also meant that the speaker was, quite simply, not a lady.

Frances Wright, who lectured that day on "Equal Instruction for all Americans," would not limit herself to the confines of true womanhood. The "true woman," a term often used by nineteenth century writers, described a pious, pure, dutiful, and domestic lady. Women, thought to be naturally religious, drew boundless strength from that inner resource. Eminently stable, women were the keepers of society's social unit, the family. In her domestic role the true woman was yielding, yet quietly powerful. The nation's future, for instance, rested on the kinds of citizens she raised. By her ceaseless Christian example, she could uplift her husband's coarser character, and through the roles of housekeeper and nurse, a man could be made dependent on her presence. One nineteenth century woman's magazine interpreted the essence of womanly power this way:

> The man bears rule over his wife's person and conduct. She bears rule over his inclinations: he governs by law; she by persuasion. . . . The empire of the woman is an empire of softness . . . [and] her commands are caresses, her menaces are tears.[10]

Her influence was exerted in indirect ways, certainly never openly expressed in a logical, forthright way. She was a fragile, passive, nervous creature who by her very nature eschewed intellectual pursuits. She provided a submissive, moral counterpart to her husband's sexually aggressive, active, rational temperament. She was cast as "the princess yoked to the barbarian chieftain."[11] The true woman, fulfilled as a mother and kept occupied with morally uplifting household tasks such as cleaning, cooking, or flower-arranging, aimed for perfection in all her roles. However, the "very perfection of True Womanhood," says one historian of American women, "carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction. For if woman was so very little less than the angels, she should surely take a more active part in running the world, especially since men were making such a hash of things."[12]

The passive qualities of the true woman were not simply unwritten social custom. The submissive status of women was etched into the legal code as well. English common law had been transferred to the United States, and Blackstone's legal maxim, "The husband and wife are one and that one is the husband," applied to American women. Legally, a woman was a minor. She could neither sue nor be sued, she could not sign a contract, be a guardian, or execute a will. Upon marriage the husband gained all rights to his wife's property and assumed legal responsibility for her conduct. A wife could be legally beaten, had no claim to her own earnings, and had no legal rights concerning her children.[13] This unjust treatment of women was a prime target for early feminists, even though they realized that a change in underlying attitudes towards women would have to accompany any amelioration of their legal situation.

Frances Wright, who settled in the United States in the 1820's, and Margaret Fuller, an American intellectual who edited a transcendentalist literary magazine in the 1840's, were the first to urge that American women seek the vote. When Wright's utopian community at Nashoba failed in 1828, she concentrated on promoting feminism, organizing unions, and opposing slavery. Allied with reformer Robert Dale Owen, she founded the Free Enquirers, a group whose tenets included espousal of free love and control of conception as the means of woman's emancipation. Wright, who urged women not to "forfeit [their] individual rights," was the first woman to publicly lecture in America, and one of the first to edit and write for a radical journal.[14] She not only advocated political and sexual equality, but also pointed out that clergymen helped keep women in an inferior position by making them "ignorant, devout and superstitious."[15] Wright's radical doctrines, echoed fifteen years later in Margaret Fuller's Woman in the Nineteenth Century, included many of the issues and demands expressed by feminists later in the century. Wright called for sexual equality and underscored woman's equality as a moral being; Fuller concentrated on proving woman's equal intellectual capacity.

The cult of true womanhood and the radical ideas of Wright and Fuller represented the two polarities of early nineteenth century thought concerning woman's social role. Wright, obviously, was an anomaly among women in the 1820's. During the next decade a growing number of women began to realize the inconsistency between their theoretical, elevated image and their actual, inequitable treatment.

These early stirrings of discontent were in part a response to the changing economic situation which freed some women from time-consuming household chores during a period when their participation in social and moral reforms was becoming more frequent. In a more immediate sense, the early woman's rights movement was sparked by the entrance of women into abolition. Here they were exposed to the ideology of humanitarian reform, but at the same time they were restricted in their work as abolitionists because of prevailing social attitudes concerning the proper sphere of womanly activity.[16]

Between 1828 and 1832, women began to move from their sewing and literary circles into reform and welfare societies. Ardent supporters of temperance, Bible and missionary societies, women were "called out" by William Lloyd Garrison to support the cause of abolition. In an early 1832 issue of the Liberator he wrote:

> The cause of bleeding humanity is always legitimately the cause of women. Without her powerful assistance, its progress must be slow, difficult, imperfect. A million females in this country are recognized and held as property -- or used for the gratification of the lust or avarice or convenience of unprincipled speculators. . . . Have these no claim upon the sympathies -- prayers -- charities -- exertions of our white country-women? When woman's heart is bleeding, shall woman's voice be hushed?[17]

Many local abolitionist societies were organized in direct response to Garrison's plea, including the influential Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society (BFAS). The Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society (PFAS) was formed in 1833, a few weeks after the AASS had been organized in that city. Three women, including Lucretia Mott, had been invited to watch the proceedings of the new national society. Following her Quaker inclination of speaking out when so moved, Mott urged the male delegates not to back down because of intense local opposition to the cause. Finding that the men responded positively to her impromptu remarks, she made a longer speech the next day in favor of the free produce movement, arguing that abolitionists buy only the products of free labor.[18] Mott and her companions did not sign the Society's Declaration of Sentiments, nor did they expect to be accorded that honor. Inspired nonetheless by their limited participation in the AASS's formation, several Philadelphia women sought to found their own society. Mott, expressing ignorance as to "the meaning of preambles, and resolutions, and votings," accepted the organizational help of black abolitionist James McCrummel.[19] With Mott as the president and pace-setter of the PFAS, the sixty-member group raised money, distributed the Liberator and other abolitionist literature, sponsored a school for free Negroes, supported the free produce movement, and began a petition campaign. By 1834 there were similar societies engaged in similar activities in most American cities and large towns. By the turn of the decade women comprised approximately half of the abolitionist work force. From 1832 on, women were involved in most aspects of the movement, constantly expanding their role. In 1834, the BFAS hired English abolitionist George Thompson to speak, and squarely faced the mob action that resulted from his visit. Women organized the first Antislavery Convention for American Women in 1837, and the following year, when an abolitionist petition was sent to Congress, women were primarily responsible for gathering its half-million signatures.[20]

Sarah and Angelina Grimke, the two Southerners who focused public attention on the woman question in the late 1830's, were won over to the cause of abolition in 1835 and 1836. Angelina became involved with the movement after hearing George Thompson's 1835 Philadelphia speech. In May of that year she joined the PFAS, persuading Sarah to join the following year. The new converts swept through New England in 1837, lecturing against the evils and inhumanity of slavery. Angelina's rapport with an audience was particularly strong, and the sisters drew crowds -- including men -- in even the smallest village. Men attended the Grimke lectures for the same reasons women went. Curiosity was the initial attraction. According to the accepted social customs, their reputation for logic and eloquence was inconsistent with the fact of their womanhood. Judging by the number of conversions they made, however, their audiences were quite convinced by the Grimkes' appeal.[21] Angelina and Sarah, aside from their shocking occupation as women lecturers, had another unique characteristic: they were Southerners. Their arguments carried a force of first-hand knowledge absent in the lectures of most abolitionist speakers. Even for the few Northerners who had visited the South, none could have witnessed the system of slavery as had Sarah and Angelina. "I lived too long in the midst of slavery, not to know what slavery is," wrote Angelina in 1836. "When I speak of this system, 'I speak that I do know. . . .'"[22] The fact of Sarah's southern birth gave credence to her claim that

> There is a diversity of opinion among [Southerners] in reference to slavery, and the REIGN OF TERROR alone suppresses the free expression of sentiment. . . . There are thousands [in the South] who believe slave-holding to be sinful, who secretly wish the abolitionists success. . . .[23]

Angelina believed that the South had a clear-cut choice on how to end slavery. "It is manifest to every reflecting mind," Angelina wrote to southern women, "that slavery must be abolished. . . . Now there are only two ways in which it can be effected, by moral power, or physical force. . . ."[24] To Catherine Beecher, Angelina was more graphic:

> The time will come, and at no distant day, when we shall be involved in all the horrors of a servile war, which will not end until both sides have suffered much, until the land shall be everywhere red with blood, and until the slaves or the whites are totally exterminated. If there be any truth in history, and if the time has not arrived when causes have ceased to produce their legitimate results, the dreadful catastrophe in which I have predicted that our slave system must result, if persisted in, is as inevitable as any event which has already transpired.[25]

Sarah, who had been denied a full education as a child, concentrated one of her critical attacks on the slaveowners' control of the Negro's mind:

> The system of slavery is necessarily cruel. The lust of dominion inevitably produces hardness of heart, because the state of mind which craves unlimited power, such as slavery confers, involves a desire to use that power, and although I know there are exceptions to the exercise of barbarity on the bodies of slaves, I maintain that there can be no exceptions to the exercise of the most soul-withering cruelty on the minds of the enslaved. All around is the mighty ruin of the intellect. . . ."[26]

The ultimate aim of the Grimkes' lectures and pamphlets was to muster support for immediatism. As Angelina tersely phrased it, "I have seen too much of slavery to be a gradualist."[27]

The sisters, separated in age by thirteen years, were members of a prominent South Carolina family. Each had rebelled early against slavery, believing human bondage "inconsistent with justice and humanity."[28] In her memoirs, Sarah recalled her earliest act of resistance, teaching her slave-girl to read and write. "The light was put out," she remembered, "the keyhole screened, and flat on our stomachs, before the fire, with the spelling book under our eyes, we defied the laws of South Carolina."[29] In turn, each sister exiled herself from the South, settling in Philadelphia and adopting Quakerism. After six years in the North, followed by a tortured period of self-examination, Angelina was persuaded that she must act upon her antislavery convictions. In 1835, profoundly distressed by the mob action against abolitionists and by the burning of antislavery literature in her native Charleston, she wrote a lengthy, private letter to Garrison, detailing her concern:

> The ground upon which you stand is holy ground: never -- never surrender it. If you surrender it, the hope of the slave is extinguished. . . . If persecution is the means which God has ordained for the accomplishment of this great end, EMANCIPATION; then . . . I feel as if I could say, LET IT COME; for it is my deep, solemn deliberate conviction, that this is a cause worth dying for.[30]

Garrison realized the potential impact of such a statement from an exiled Southerner of aristocratic lineage, and although Angelina had not given her express permission, he reprinted the letter in the Liberator. Angelina had suspected that this might happen, but was unprepared for the unfavorable reaction of friends and family. Sarah and several close Quaker friends implored her to retract the letter. Angelina despaired at having "[brought] disgrace upon my family," but maintained her stand. As her biographer notes, "It was a symbolic act, a public gesture of commitment from one world to another."[31]

The following year Sarah too saw the light, and throughout 1836 the Grimkes were exposed to an ever-widening circle of abolitionists. Their views on the subject were sharpened during hours of deep discussion, and their sensibilities toward the question of slavery were refined by a new awareness. They realized the prejudice inherent in certain Quaker practices, especially the custom of segregating Negro members in one "colored bench."[32] Their protests against such prejudice were at first tentative and cautious, and their involvement with antislavery or abolitionist activity limited to parlor discussions, support of the free produce movement, and membership in the PFAS. As Angelina's convictions became more sure, she suddenly decided that the time had come for direct action.[33] In two weeks she penned the famous Appeal to the Christian Women of the South, styled almost as a personal letter, and characterized by the absence of moralistic, strident language usually employed by abolitionists. She asserted the slave's natural right to freedom, and professed her belief that such bondage was contrary to the Biblical charter of human rights, contrary to the teachings of Christ, and "contrary to the declaration of our independence." She wrote that American slavery "reduces a man to a thing, a "chattel personal," robs him of all his rights as a human being, fetters both his mind and body, and protects the master in the most unnatural and unreasonable power, whilst it throws him out of the protection of the law."[34] Angelina knew that the women did "not make the laws," but she knew too that as "wives and mothers," as "sisters and daughters," they could indirectly influence their menfolk. "Try to persuade your husband, father, brothers and sons," she urged, "that slavery is a crime against God and man. . . ." She wanted southern women to talk about their views, to pray and to petition legislatures, to read about antislavery, to free whichever slaves they personally owned, and at least to educate them even if it meant breaking state laws. She was intensely concise: "If a law commands me to sin I will break it. . . ." This doctrine of a higher law later became the abolitionist justification for resistance to the Fugitive Slave Act.[35]

Angelina's Appeal was published by the AASS, and the tract renewed the Society's interest in securing her as an abolitionist speaker for New York women's groups. Sarah, a recent convert to the cause, was sent with her younger sister to the Agent's Convention of the AASS, where abolitionist lecturers were trained under the direction of the formidable Theodore Weld.[36] Their parlor talks in New York drew such crowds that the meetings were transferred to a nearby Baptist church, a move that caused some abolitionists, such as Gerrit Smith, to fear that too public a lecture would degenerate into a "Fanny Wright affair."[37] Weld encouraged the Grimkes to continue the series, and at their first talk, held in a church, a gentleman who tried to sneak into the audience had to be ousted by the presiding Reverend. At their lecture in Poughkeepsie, New York, the men who managed to infiltrate the hall stayed, and the sisters addressed their first mixed audience.

After their winter lecture tour of New York ended in triumph, Sarah and Angelina attended the first Anti-Slavery Convention of American Women. The convention was an organizational success, a fact which Angelina pointedly related to Weld. In a letter to her mentor, she first relayed a message from one of the convention secretaries: "'Tell Mr. Weld, said she, that when the women got together, they found they had minds of their own, and could transact their business without his directions.'" Angelina added that, "The Boston and Philadelphia women were so well versed in business that they were quite mortified to have Mr. Weld quoted as authority for doing or not doing so and so -- as they frequently did."[38] It had been just over three years since the BFAS and PFAS had been formed, but the women had obviously grasped the essentials of organizing groups and meetings. The Anti-Slavery Convention published Angelina's Appeal to the Women of the Nominally Free States and Sarah's Address to Free Colored Americans. Angelina lectured to the delegates on racial discrimination, urging northern women to recognize female slaves as "our sisters." As for male Negroes, she said, "Women ought to feel a peculiar sympathy in the colored man's wrong, for, like him, she has been accused of mental inferiority, and denied the privileges of a liberal education."[39] Angelina had consistently defended the right of women to speak on political topics, an area traditionally reserved for men. She told the delegates that

> No intelligent woman ought to be ignorant of this great subject -- no Christian woman can escape the obligation now resting upon her, to examine it for herself. . . . The denial of our duty to act in this cause is a denial of our right to act; and if we have no right to act, then may we well be termed 'the white slaves of the North,' for like our brethren in bonds, we must seal our lips in silence and despair. . . . Are we aliens because we are women? Are we bereft of citizenship because we are the mothers, wives and daughters of a mighty people? Have women no country -- no interest staked in public weal . . . no partnership in a nation's guilt and shame?[40]

By the Convention's end the sisters' reputation was national. They were inundated with invitations to speak out West and in New England. Under the auspices of the AASS (although not as bona fide agents), the Grimkes agreed to lecture in Boston during the coming winter. Maria Weston Chapman, president of the BFAS, noted that

> One thing . . . which marks them as eminently qualified for the promulgation of antislavery principles [is] the elevated and Christian point of view from which they behold the condition of woman; her duties and her consequent rights. It is of paramount importance that both men and women should understand their true positions and mighty responsibilities to this and to coming generations.[41]

The sisters were not deliberately intent on injecting the question of woman's rights into their abolitionist lectures. They concentrated only on speaking out against slavery, but they did it with such authority and eloquence that men were attracted to the lectures; and it was this "promiscuous" mixture that especially alarmed traditionalists. Audiences of one-thousand were not unusual and in Lynn, Massachusetts, the South Carolinians addressed their first sizable mixed audience. The hall, according to one first hand account, was "crowded to excess. About 600 seated, many went away, about 100 stood around the door . . . [and] on each window on the outside stood three men with their heads above the lowered sash."[42] Although the audiences did not seem outraged at having witnessed women lecturing in public (a substantial percentage of Grimke audiences were in fact converted to the cause), both abolitionists and clergy were not pleased at such an unorthodox spectacle. Sarah's Letters on the Equality of the Sexes, which dealt exclusively with the woman question, reinforced the fears of some abolitionists that their cause was becoming "impure."[43] At the same time Angelina was writing a series titled Letters to Catherine Beecher, in which she detailed her arguments against colonization, and for immediatism. In one letter on "women's sphere," Angelina advanced daring opinions on the political rights of women:

> The right of petition is the only right that women have: why not let them exercise it whenever they are aggrieved? . . .
>
> Now, I believe it is woman's right to have a voice in all the laws and regulations by which she is to be governed, whether in Church or State; and that the present arrangements of society, on these points, are a violation of human rights, a rank usurpation of power, a violent seizure and confiscation of what is sacredly and inalienably hers. . . . If Ecclesiastical and Civil governments are ordained by God, then I contend that woman has just as much right to sit in solemn counsel in Conventions, Conferences, Associations and General Assemblies, as man -- just as much right to sit upon the throne of England, or in the Presidential Chair of the United States.[44]

The underpinning of Angelina's argument was the doctrine of human rights. "My doctrine," she said, "is that whatever is morally right for a man to do, it is morally right for a woman to do. . . . I recognize no rights but human rights -- I know nothing of men's rights and women's rights; for in Jesus Christ, there is neither male nor female."[45] Angelina also perceived that woman's rights was a logical outgrowth of the abolitionists' fight against slavery. As she phrased it,

> The discussion of the rights of the slave has opened the way for the discussion of other rights, and the ultimate result will certainly be, 'the breaking of every yoke,' the letting the oppressed of every grade and description go free, -- an emancipation far more glorious than any the world has ever yet seen. . . .[46]

Sarah's Letters on the Equality of the Sexes were penned in response to Pastoral Letter issued in 1837 by the General Association of

Congregational Ministers. New England clergymen had long felt that their authority was being eroded by the influx of abolitionist speakers into their pulpits. The thrust of the Pastoral Letter was aimed at the Grimkes' dangerously "inappropriate" behavior. "Female character" was being threatened, and these ministers made it clear that they believed the true woman was a submissive creature. "The power of a woman is her dependence," they said, "flowing from the consciousness of that weakness which God has given her for her protection." The Pastoral Letter warned that when a woman

> assumes the place and tone of man as a public reformer, our care and protection of her seem unnecessary . . . and her character becomes unnatural. If the vine, whose strength and beauty it is to lean upon the trelliswork, and half conceal its clusters, thinks to assume the independence and overshadowing nature of the elm, it will not only cease to bear fruit, but fall in shame and dishonor into the dust.[47]

Sarah's rebuttal was grounded in erudite theological arguments, but her touchstone was the doctrine of human equality. Stressing the spiritual, she answered that "Man and woman were created equal, they are both moral and accountable beings, and what is right for man to do is right for woman." If this precept were indeed true, then women should be able to participate in "moral reformations" as fully as men. "The woman who prays in sincerity for the regeneration of this guilty world, will accompany her prayers by her labors." Sarah recounted a friend's experience which typified the motivation of female abolitionists. "I was sitting in my chamber," said the friend,

> weeping over the miseries of the slave, and putting up my prayers for his delivery from bondage, when in the midst of my meditations it occurred to me that my tears, unaided by effort, could never melt the chain of the slave. I must be up and doing.[48]

Angelina and Sarah were particularly concerned about the reaction of their close friend Theodore Weld to their New England activities. The three corresponded frequently, and Weld was clearly dismayed that the sisters were diverting the abolitionist cause with their emphasis on woman's rights. In reply to a letter from Angelina in which she irately asked if indeed she and Sarah were bona fide agents of the AASS, Weld assured them that the AASS would not publicly condemn their efforts (as the sisters had feared), but neither would the Executive Committee claim them as agents. "Your relation to the Executive Committee," he wrote,

> seems rather a relation of Christian kindness -- a sort of cooperative relation recognizing harmony of views and feelings. . . . In short the relation which you sustain to the Executive Committee no more attached their sanction to your public holdings-forth to promiscuous assemblies than it does to your 'theeing and thouing'. . . . If any gainsay your speaking in public and to men, they gainsay the Quakers and not the abolitionists.[49]

Weld quickly added that he personally wished that antislavery women would speak out with a courageous "heart and head." He told Angelina that "If the men wish to come it is downright slaveholding to shut them out. . . . Why! folks talk about women's preaching as though it was next to highway robbery -- eyes astare and mouths agape." Despite this assertion Weld soon discovered that these personal views conflicted with his duties as an abolitionist tactician.

In her reply to Weld in August, 1837, Angelina cast her feminist position in unequivocal terms. "I cannot help feeling some regret," she said, "that [woman's rights] should have come up before the Anti Slavery question was settled, so fearful am I that it may injure that blessed cause. . . ." But she stressed that "it had come now and . . . the exigency must be met with . . . firmness." Sure that the AASS would disown them because of the uproar caused by the denunciatory Pastoral Letter, Angelina nonetheless made it clear that they were not preaching the rights of women because they were Quakers.

> As to our being Quakers being an excuse for our speaking in public, we do not stand on this ground at all; we ask no favors for ourselves, but claim rights for our sex. . . .
>
> Now we want thee to sustain us on the high ground of MORAL RIGHT, not of Quaker peculiarity. This question must be met now. . . . Can't thou stand just here side by side with us?[50]

Weld could not. He reiterated his belief "that woman in EVERY particular shares equally with man's rights and responsibilities."[51] But he believed that the Grimkes' particular advantage as southern abolitionists was lost "the moment [they took] another subject." The key to Weld's objection concerned tactics. To him the abolitionist cause was the most crucial issue in the fight for human rights. If abolition were achieved, then the general principle of equal rights for all would be won as well. Society would then be amenable to accepting equal rights for women. "Again," he emphasized,

> the abolitionist question is most powerfully preparative and introductory to the other question. By pushing the former with all our might we are most effectively advancing the latter. By absorbing the public mind in the greatest of all violations of rights, we are purging its vision to detect other violations. . . . Mind gravitates from a general principle to its collaterals. . . . Let us all first wake up the nation to lift millions of slaves of both sexes from the dust . . . and it will be an easy matter to take millions of females from their knees. . . .[52]

Angelina was incensed. She reminded Weld that just a few years ago abolitionists had fought to maintain the right of free speech. Women, she determined, must follow suit. "The *time* to assert a right is *the* time when *that* right is denied. *We must establish this right* for if we do not, it will be impossible for *us* to go *on with the work of Emancipation*." Not only did Angelina fear that passivity would hasten the closure of all churches to female abolitionists, but she also elucidated "a fundamental organizational principle."[53] Angelina wrote that

> If we surrender the right to *speak* to the public this year, we must surrender the right to petition next year and the right to *write* the year after. . . .
> And can you not see that women *could* do, and *would* do a hundred times more for the slave if she were not fettered?[54]

The Grimkes must have recognized an essential inconsistency in abolitionist ideology on this point, for abolitionists (theoretically, at least) had accepted their black colleagues as equals, primarily on the basis of human rights. In the 1830's the abolitionist cause was so unpopular that solidarity among *all* its adherents should have been a cardinal organizational tenet. Angelina agreed with Weld that woman's rights was part of the broader fight for human rights, but she was sure that the "general principle" of human rights would not be advanced by ignoring the obvious problem of woman's limited role as reformer. "Keeping different moral reformations entirely distinct," was illogical. "We cannot push Abolitionism forward with all our might until we take up the stumbling block [of woman's rights] out of the road." The two causes, she said, "are bound together in a circle like the science. They blend with each other like the colors of the rainbow, they are parts only of our glorious whole and that whole is Christianity."[55] Weld agreed with the

Grimkes' aims, but not with their methods. To Sarah and Angelina the woman question was as integral a part of human rights as was abolition. For Weld, slavery ranked as the greatest injustice, and its abolition claimed top priority.

Weld's apprehension that intrusion of the woman question would undercut the Grimkes' effectiveness as abolitionist speakers was unfounded. The crowds they drew and the numbers they converted were both considerable, and the New England tour was a proselytizing success.[56] The lecture series was capped by Angelina's speech before the Massachusetts legislature, the first time a woman addressed a legislative assembly. "On behalf of 20,000 women of Massachusetts," she presented antislavery petitions to the state representatives:

> Because it [abolition] is a political subject, it has often been tauntingly said that women have nothing to do with it. . . . I hold, Mr. Chairman, that American women have to do with this subject, not only because it is moral and religious, but because it is political, in as much as we are all citizens of this republic, and as such our honor, our happiness, and well-being are bound up in its politics, government, and laws.[57]

Both her speech and her speaking ability were highly praised, and Angelina was granted two additional hearings before the legislature in order to fully air her views. Crowds packed the hall each time, and at her Odeon speeches the following weeks, (held in the old Boston music hall), capacity crowds filled every seat as well as all available standing room.

With the New England tour thus ended, she prepared for her impending marriage to Weld, anxious to disprove friends' fears that domesticity would finish her reforming career and to disprove as well the traditionalists' claim that such a bold, unsexed woman could not "catch and keep" a husband. In the long run, Angelina's career was curtailed by managing a household and raising three children; nonetheless, both she and her husband participated in the Second Antislavery Convention of American Women, held in Philadelphia's Pennsylvania Hall two days after their wedding.

The convention, and the existence of the hall itself, were bitterly opposed by many Philadelphians. Abolitionists had consistently encountered problems in renting lecture halls in Philadelphia for their antislavery meetings. In 1836, several wealthy patrons financed the design and construction of an enormous lecture hall to be dedicated to the right of free discussion. Located two blocks from Independence Square, the new Pennsylvania Hall was a two-story brick structure occupied by shops and offices on the main floor, and topped by a lecture hall with a seating capacity of three thousand. Dedication ceremonies on May 14, 1838, emphasized the policy that the hall would be open to anyone who paid the rent. For the next two days Pennsylvania Hall was used for temperance meetings, or for the Philadelphia Lyceum's science lectures. On the sixteenth of May, the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society and the Anti-Slavery Convention of American Women rented the hall. The first evening's program featured Garrison, Maria Weston Chapman, and Angelina Grimke Weld -- a mixed platform of speakers.[58] An unruly mob gathered in the street to protest both the abolitionist meeting itself and the "promiscuous" roster of lecturers. The Garrison and Chapman speeches were interrupted by shouting, and when the newly-wed Angelina Grimke Weld rose to speak, brickbats and other "missiles" came crashing through the windows. Requests for police protection were ignored, and late the following night, when the building was empty, Pennsylvania Hall was burned to the ground.

Angelina's speech at the convention was one of her last public appearances, although she did continue her writing against slavery. The speaker who followed her that noisy evening was a young Quaker woman who was delivering her first speech against slavery. Abby Kelley's speech so impressed Weld that he urged her to become an abolitionist lecturer. "Abby, if you don't," he admonished, "God will smite you!"[59] As Angelina's career as an orator was ending Kelley's was just taking hold, and in the next two years her "unwomanly" activities provided the ostensible cause of the AASS split.

Abby Kelley had been inspired to speak out against slavery after hearing the Grimkes' lecture in Lynn, Massachusetts, during the sisters' New England tour. Her position on the role of female abolition was succinctly expressed in a letter to the PFAS in 1838:

> We see that the Pennsylvania women are fast striking their own shackles off, and coming forward, in full freedom of spirit, to unbind the poor slave. May all who seek to give freedom to others, soon learn that they can accomplish but little, so long as themselves are loaded with shackles.[60]

From 1838 until she lost her speaking voice in the 1840's, Kelley was among the movement's most prominent female orators. After the AASS voted to define women as "persons" in order to make them constitutionally eligible for membership in the Society, Kelley and many other women became active participants in the national organization. The Society's motive for including women was, it seems, pecuniary, for to be "members in good standing," women were obliged to pay dues to help support the financially strapped Society.[61] Whatever the reason for allowing women to officially join the AASS, the ensuing events were unexpected by most of the male members. In 1840, Garrison nominated Kelley to serve on an executive committee, a position previously preserved for men. The propriety of allowing a female to hold such a key position was hotly debated, but Kelley's nomination was approved by a vote of 557-451. The abolitionists who opposed Kelley's nomination walked out of the meeting and formed the rival, more conservative and socially acceptable abolitionist organization, the American & Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (A & F). Although the causes of the 1840 split involved more than Kelley's nomination to an executive post, the woman question did pose crucial ideological and tactical problems for abolitionists. Garrison and many other radicals interpreted abolition and woman's rights as compatible parts of one broad cause, the fight for universal emancipation and human rights. Garrison heartily supported the Grimkes' efforts, and believed that women must win political enfranchisement. He said,

> Among the 'self-evident truths' announced in the Declaration of Independence, is this: 'All government derives its just power from the consent of the governed.' Judging by this rule, the existing government is a despotism. One half of the population is disfranchised on account of sex; three millions are dehumanized on account of complexion![62]

Lewis Tappan and James Birney, who headed the conservative A & F, were adamant that abolition not be side-tracked by any other cause, including woman's rights. Tappan, however, in a letter to Weld, made clear two additional points. He was extremely antagonistic to what he considered "the bad spirit of the Liberator," and to

Garrison's use of "the Society as an instrument" to put ancillary causes before the public. Tappan also revealed his bias against the full participation of women. He wrote that

> When the Constitution of the A. Anti S. Soc. was formed in 1833, and the word 'person' introduced, *all concerned* considered that it was to be understood as it is usually understood in our benevolent Societies. All have a right to be *members*, but the *business* [is] to be conducted by the men. This understanding continued for 6 years [until] W. L. G. [Garrison] introduced the question into the Anti S. Soc. to make an experiment upon the public. . . . Women have equal rights with men and therefore they have a right to form societies of women only. Men have the same right. *Men* formed the Amer. Anti S. Society.[63]

From a tactical viewpoint, Tappan and Birney believed not only that abolition should be their paramount cause, but that full inclusion of women in the Society's activities would alienate the public. Weld, whose reaction to the union of abolition with woman's rights had been revealed in his letters to Angelina Grimke, was left without an organization after 1840. He could not accept what he called the "no woman" American & Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, nor was he comfortable in what he considered the ideologically impure AASS.

In June of 1840, one month after the AASS split over the woman question, the first World's Anti-Slavery Convention (WASC) was convened in England. British abolitionists made it clear that women would not be welcomed as delegates, but Garrisonians were determined to freely choose their own representatives. Several female delegates were sent to London from the AASS and various state abolition societies. Ann Green Phillips and her husband Wendell were delegates, and the PFAS sent Lucretia Mott as one of its five-woman delegation. In all, eight women made the crossing to England, while four other female delegates "were either unable to make the trip or did not wish to challenge the wishes of the London Committee."[64] At pre-convention meetings, women refused to "accept exclusion without controversy."[65] Two of the convention secretaries, Wendell Phillips and Henry Stanton, were intent upon injecting the woman question into debate. On the first day, Phillips suggested that all those with proper credentials be admitted as delegates. Americans, reflecting the division within the AASS, split their vote on accepting female delegates, while most Englishmen and all clergymen were opposed. The rejected women were at least allowed to sit in a visitors' gallery, concealed behind a curtain. When Garrison (the great American hero of abolition in the eyes of his English colleagues) arrived several days late, the woman question again came to the fore. Much to the Englishmen's chagrin, Garrison (and two other AASS delegates) chose to sit in the gallery with the women. On the WASC's closing day, Wendell Phillips read a protest against excluding female delegates, but the speech was tabled and therefore not recorded in the official minutes. At the more informal post-convention meeting, however, Mott was asked to speak, and her extemporaneous lecture on the free produce movement was well-received.

The women felt their rejection keenly, and it was in the visitors' gallery that the discontent was discussed by Mott and the newly-wed Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who was attending the convention as part of her honeymoon trip with husband Henry. Mott and Stanton "agreed to hold a woman's rights convention on their return to America," and Stanton later claimed that "The movement for woman's suffrage, both in England and America, may be dated from this World's Anti-Slavery Convention."[66]

During the decade of 1840, abolition made many new female converts who campaigned for woman's rights as well. Stanton, Lucy Stone, Susan B. Anthony and America's first female minister, Antoinette Brown, were among those who spoke publicly for abolition and woman's rights before 1850.[67] One of Stone's first speeches was a lecture on woman's rights given from her brother's pulpit. "It was probably the first time a lecture devoted solely to woman's rights was given in the United States," notes one historian, "and it shocked an audience accustomed to hearing about black slavery."[68] As antislavery and abolition were becoming more acceptable during the 1840's, woman's rights was emerging as the new radical cause. Some legal reforms had been achieved,[69] but the women and men who met in 1848 in Elizabeth Stanton's hometown fully realized the extent of the inequitable social, political and economic condition of American women.

The 1848 Seneca Falls meeting lasted three days, and was attended by a modest number of feminists, male and female, a group that was in advance of a movement. With James Mott in the chair (even his accomplished wife lacked the confidence to assume this task), Lucretia Mott opened the convention by discussing the purpose of the meeting. Elizabeth Stanton then read a "Declaration of Sentiments" based, rhetorically and ideologically, on the Declaration of Independence. Stanton's Declaration said in part:

> When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one portion of the family of man to assume among the people of the earth a position different from that they have hitherto occupied. . . .

> We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights: that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. . . .
>
> The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. . . .
>
> In entering upon the great work before us, we anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, and ridicule; but we shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our object. We shall employ agents, circulate tracts, petition the State and national legislatures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press on our behalf. We hope this Convention will be followed by a series of Conventions embracing every part of this country.[70]

Of Stanton's dozen resolutions appended to the Declaration, only one met with opposition: that women seek political enfranchisement. The resolution passed, but not without some members withdrawing their names from the Declaration in protest. Press reaction to the entire Convention was meagre and derogatory. One New York paper interpreted the Declaration as a "new, impracticable, absurd and ridiculous proposition."[71]

Despite the apathy of most American women and despite insubstantial funding, the cause of woman's rights expanded in the 1850's. Legal developments continued when Kansas, in 1853, allowed women to vote on school-related matters. Professionally, a few women were trained for positions thought suitable for men only. Antoinette Brown became an ordained minister after graduation from Oberlin, and Elizabeth Blackwell graduated with an M.D. degree from a New York medical school. At the organizational level, annual woman's rights conventions began in 1850 with a meeting in Worcester, Massachusetts.

Paulina Wright Davis, the sole organizational force behind the first convention, described its origin. "In May, 1850,' she was to recall later, "a few women in Boston attending an Anti-Slavery meeting, proposed that all who felt interested in a plan for a National Woman's Rights Convention, should consult in the anteroom."[72] Of the nine people who met initially, only Davis persevered.

The convention drew a large audience, probably because of its novelty, and the 268 official members of the convention included dozens of abolitionists. Davis, as president, delivered an eloquent address delineating the "attitude and relations of our movement to our times and circumstances and . . . the proper spirit and method of promoting it." It was obvious to Davis and her audience that the fledgling movement needed "right principles," but Davis also stressed the need for "expedient methods," lest the "most beneficent purposes utterly fail." A just cause would not prove successful unless the reformer tailored "his work to those conditions of the times which he seeks to influence."[73]

To Davis the cause of woman's rights fit within the framework of human rights, particularly as defined by the revolutionary heritage. "For some centuries now," she told her audience,

> the best of them [men] have been asserting, with their lives, the liberties and rights of the race; . . .
> We take the ground, that whatever has been achieved for the race belongs to it, and must not be usurped by any class or caste. The rights and liberties of one human being cannot be made the property of another, though they were redeemed for him or her by the life of that other; for rights cannot be forfeited by way of salvage, and they are in their nature unpurchasable and inalienable.[74]

She underscored the radicalism of woman's rights, but carefully pointed out that radical change would be achieved without violence.

> The reformation which we propose, in its utmost scope, is radical and universal. It is not the mere perfecting of a progress already in motion, a detail of some established plan, but it is an epochal movement -- the emancipation of a class, the redemption of half the world, and a conforming re-organization of all social, political, and industrial interests and institutions. . . . Its intended changes are to be wrought in the intimate texture of all societary organizations, without violence, or any form of antagonism. It seeks to replace the worn out with the living and the beautiful, so as to reconstruct without overturning, and to regenerate without destroying; and nothing in the spirit, tone, temper, or method of insurrection, is proper or allowable to us and our work.[75]

In addition to articulating the movement's theoretical premises and historical underpinnings, the Worcester convention also proposed specific remedies aimed at uplifting the American woman. The most forceful resolution made by the delegates was a claim that was to be repeated at succeeding conventions. Enlarging upon the Seneca Falls resolution of 1848 it was moved

> that women are clearly entitled to the right of suffrage, and to be considered eligible to office; the omission to demand which, on her part, is a palpable recreancy to duty, and a denial of which is a gross usurpation on the part of man, no longer to be endured.[76]

At the 1852 Syracuse Convention, the tone became more militant. Elizabeth Jones told the assembled delegates that

> Men may sooner arrest the progress of the lightning, or the clouds, or stay the waves of the sea, than the onward march of Truth with her hand on the sword and her banner unfurled. I am not in the habit of talking much about rights; I am one of those who takes them. . . . The right to vote. That includes all other rights. I want to go to the Legislative Hall, sit on the Judicial Bench, and fill the Executive Chair. Now do you understand me?[77]

The highlight of the 1851 convention was a speech by Wendell Phillips that became an influential feminist tract for the next seventy years. He told the delegates that it was useless to argue against prejudice. Women had to get out of the house to demonstrate their worthiness and success in business and government, but above all they had to win the right to vote. Dismissing as red herrings the arguments concerning woman's "true sphere," he told the convention, "We have not that presumption [to define the social roles of women]. What we ask is simply this, - what all other classes have asked before: Leave it to woman to choose for herself her profession, her education, and her sphere."[78]

Press response to these conventions was, for the most part, abusive. One of the most subdued comments was made by the National Intelligencer (Washington, D. C.). An editorial called the 1850 convention

> fruitless . . . fanaticism. . . . We are told . . . that Mrs. Davis presided with great dignity. Miss Brown [Antoinette], a beautiful young lady from Oberlin, in a fluent speech is understood to have floored St. Paul on a Bible argument. . . . Woman would have done much more for the advancement of the sex by staying home tending their babies, instructing their children, and assisting their husbands . . . these higher duties for which no woman yet ever found herself too well qualified.[79]

The press at least responded to the conventions. Most American women did not, nor did convention organizers expect a surge of popular activity. These early woman's rights leaders concentrated on building an organization, gathering a core of dedicated reformers, and developing an ideology.[80]

iii

From the first strike of female workers in 1825 to the acceptance of women members by the Knights of Labor in 1869, American working women endeavored to express grievances through labor organizations. Successes were short-lived and isolated; yet because the need to organize persisted, women continued to form labor associations and unions throughout the century. Although some radical feminists and labor leaders encouraged their efforts, these groups were not firm allies of the working woman. The objectives of mainstream feminists, for instance, were esoteric to women who spent thirteen hours a day working in shops and factories. And when men supported their strikes, it was usually because they feared the competition of cheap, non-union labor. Nevertheless, working women articulated many of the same concerns voiced by middle class feminists, male labor leaders, and other humanitarian reformers. They wanted equality with men -- not on the public platform, but in their pay envelopes. And, like their male counterparts, they viewed the situation of wage earners as a kind of slavery which deprived them of freedom.

The numbers of working women increased nearly five-fold between 1816 and 1870, and by 1837 women were engaged in over one hundred occupations.[81] Despite the few breakthroughs in the professions, such as Elizabeth Blackwell's medical degree and Antoinette Brown's theological training, most women were employed as industrial laborers. The most persistent efforts at unionization occurred among cotton mill workers, cigarmakers, typographers, boot and shoe binders, and women who worked in the needle trades.

It was during the 1820's that the newly mechanized textile industry began to attract large numbers of women. The earliest strike involving women occurred in 1824 in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, when women weavers joined the men to resist both a wage cut and an increase in hours. One hundred and two women met separately to itemize their grievances, and as one journal reported, the meeting "was conducted, however strange it may appear, without noise, or scarcely a single speech."[82] The only other strike during this decade was organized in 1828 by four hundred factory operatives in Dover, New Hampshire, to protest an increase in boarding fees. The women countered with demands for a better wage and a reduction of the working day from thirteen and a half hours to ten.

During the 1830's conditions in New England's cotton mills attracted considerable public notice because of the peculiar system developed in Lowell, Massachusetts.[83] Lowell was one of the model manufacturing towns designed in the thirties to encourage rural New Englanders to make the transition from farmer to industrial worker. The town of Lowell was particularly organized to attract unmarried farm women to the looms. Daughters of independent farmers, these women became wage earners in order to supplement the family income, to accumulate a dowry, to finance a brother's education, or simply to make a living. In order to assure parents that their daughters would not fall into the immoral ways of the English operatives, Lowell employers set up a strict system of employee supervision. Boardinghouses were staffed by company-approved matrons, church attendance was mandatory (as was an annual pew fee), membership in Improvement Circles was encouraged, and proper personal behavior became a requisite for continued employment. The Lowell girls, as they came to be called, were also asked to contribute poetry and stories about mill life to the company newspaper, the Lowell Offering. The paper was proffered as proof that literary and moral refinements were possible in an industrial environment. Compared to England's "dark, Satanic mills,"[84] Charles Dickens thought life at Lowell was impressive. Prominent Americans, including Henry Clay and John Quincy Adams, also praised Lowell. To some modern scholars, however, the paternalistic system was designed to prevent a permanent proletariat by insuring a quick turnover of closely supervised workers.[85] During the thirties the long, low wagons which transported farm girls into the mill towns became known as "slavers,"[86] and one weaver denounced the editor of the Lowell Offering as "the mouthpiece of the corporations."[87] Another labor journal, the Voice of Industry, was also critical. It conceded that the Lowell Offering showed that there was "mind among the spindles," but added that "this does not show that mind was made among the spindles, or that factory life under the present system is conducive to the expression and cultivation of the intellectual powers of the operatives."[88]

Dissatisfaction at Lowell surfaced in the mid-thirties. When employers announced a 15 percent cut in wages in 1834, women rejected the mill owners' assumption that a decrease in profits be offset by reducing wages. Between eight hundred and two thousand women "turned out" of the factories and listened to "a flaming . . . speech on the rights of women and the iniquities of the 'monied aristocracy'. . . ."[89] The spontaneous resolve quickly disintegrated when the leaders of the strike were barred from work the day after the meeting. The other women, faced with mass discharge, returned to the looms.

Lowell workers struck again two years later. Employers cited sharp competition and a decrease in profits to justify wage cuts and an increase in hours. Boardinghouse fees were also raised, between twelve and sixteen women were now crowded into sleeping quarters, and a blacklist instituted. Clearly, working conditions were deteriorating. The result of the strike was not recorded, but the rallying song of the 1836 strike, a parody of an anti-Catholic ditty titled "I Can't Be A Nun," mirrored the discontent:

> Oh, isn't it a pity, such a pretty girl as I
> Should be sent into the factory to pine away and die?
> Oh, I cannot be a slave,
> I will not be a slave,
> For I'm so fond of liberty
> That I cannot be a slave.[90]

The Harbinger, a Fourierist newspaper, also saw a connection between slavery and mill labor. In an 1845 issue one reviewer wrote that

> Everybody knows that it is necessity alone . . . that takes them [the girls] to Lowell and that keeps them there. Is this freedom? To our minds it is slavery quite as really [sic.] as any in Turkey or Carolina. It matters little as to the fact of slavery, whether the slave be compelled to his tasks by the whip of the overseer or the wages of the Lowell Corporations.[91]

There were other strikes by women mill operatives in the early thirties, but none are recorded between the 1837 financial panic and 1850. The depressed economy forced workers to accept any employment.

Discontent at Lowell during the 1840's focused on the move to establish the ten hour day. Since 1842, New England workers had petitioned state governments to legalize a shorter working day, and in 1844 the Massachusetts legislature created an investigative committee. This was the first official investigation of labor conditions in American factories. One response by workers was formation of the Lowell Female Labor Reform Association, headed by Sarah Bagley, a factory worker who had been secretly planning the association for a year. Bagley administered a petition campaign that collected two thousand signatures in support of the ten hour day, and helped muster support in many other mill towns. In 1845 the state's investigative committee invited eight witnesses to testify, including Bagley and five other factory women. Bagley described the rigors of the seventy-four hour work week and detailed the unhealthy working conditions in the mills. The twelve-to-thirteen hour day was spent in noisy, poorly ventilated rooms which filled with the stench of tallow candles during dark evenings and winters. Except for forty minute breaks for lunch and dinner, women stood all day threading spindles and tending machines. "Such unmitigated labor," she told them, "is to the highest degree destructive to the health . . . and serves to injure the constitutions of future generations."[92] In their formal decision, committee members sympathized with the plight of mill workers, but made it clear that ten hour legislation would not be recommended. Such action, legislators said, would merely force mills to move to other states.

Sarah Bagley has been called the "first woman trade unionist of note in the United States."[93] She was hired by the Hamilton Manufacturing Company of Lowell in 1836, and wrote newspaper articles praising the company until 1840. During the forties, as working conditions steadily worsened, Bagley agitated for reform and insisted that operatives organize. After her involvement with the ten hour movement, she left her job at the Hamilton mill and intensified her reform efforts. Under her direction a loose federation of female reform associations was developed in mill towns throughout New England and the middle Atlantic states. The women were successful at preventing some wage cuts and work increases, and in 1845 her own association helped defeat a local anti-labor legislator. Also in that year, the Lowell group purchased the type and presses of the Voice of Industry. With Bagley as chief editor, the paper urged legalization of the ten hour day and lambasted the Lowell Offering. The Offering, claimed the Voice of Industry (July 17, 1845),

> is and always has been under the fostering care of the corporations as a literary repository of the mental gems of those operatives who have the ability, time and inclination to write, and the tendency of it ever has been to gloss over the evils, wrongs and privations of factory life.

At the Woburn Fourth of July celebrations in 1845 she told two thousand workingmen that the Lowell Offering was controlled by the company to "give gloss to their inhumanity."[94] Soon after these attacks, the Offering ceased publication. Bagley was also an organizer for the New England Workingmen's Association, held executive positions in two labor organizations, and served as a delegate to several labor conventions and congresses in 1845 and 1846. She was a co-founder of Lowell's Industrial Reform Lyceum which invited William Lloyd Garrison and Horace Greeley to lecture. After the defeat of the ten hour movement, Bagley's health gave out, possibly from an accumulation of cotton dust in her lungs. Her career as a labor agitator ceased abruptly, and in 1847 another mill woman assumed the presidency of the Lowell Female Reform Association.[95] Many of the farm women quit the mills during the late 1840's and early 1850's, supplanted by poor, unskilled Irish immigrants.

Shoe and boot binders, the women who stitched and bound the factory-cut uppers, constituted one of the most poorly paid female industries. In Massachusetts over fifteen thousand women worked in the shoe industry for wages that varied from eight to fifty cents a day.[96] The town of Lynn was the center of the women's shoe trade, employing sixteen hundred women in the early thirties. In 1833, in order to protest a wage cut, the women organized the Female Society of Lynn and Vicinity for the protection and promotion of Female Industry. The society drafted a wage scale for various kinds of binding, and successfully went on strike to enforce their demands. These efforts prompted Lynn textile workers to form a Factory Girls Association in 1834. When the Female Society of Lynn and Vicinity sent two male delegates to the opening meeting of the Trades' Union of Boston in 1834, it claimed a membership of one thousand. Soon after, the society warned that union regulations "have been broken and disregarded by many of its members, who have taken work under price."[97] The society's effectiveness was thus undercut, and it dissolved in 1835.

Women binders in New York and Philadelphia also organized in the 1830's. In May of that year, the New York Ladies' Shoe Binders Society was organized in order to work out a scale of prices. There was also a Ladies' Cordwainers Society of New York, which in April of 1835 was asked by the Philadelphia cordwainers not to admit travelling journeymen without a certificate from their hometown union.[98] This was common practice among unions, and insured that strikers from one city didn't seek employment in a nearby town. The Female Association of Binders and Corders of the city and county of Philadelphia was formed in 1836 with a membership of four hundred. When the women went on a one month strike for higher wages, the male cordwainers who worked with them offered financial and moral support. Similarly, the national shoemakers' union also supported unionization of women in their trade.[99]

Cordwainers, like other wage earners and humanitarian reformers, justified their dissent by citing the rhetoric of the American Revolution. In 1844 New England cordwainers defended their turnout by rephrasing the Declaration of Independence, arguing that

> Whereas, our employers have robbed us of certain rights which they will, in our opinion, never voluntarily restore . . . we feel bound to rise unitedly in our strength and burst asunder as freemen ought the shackles and fetters with which they have long been chaining and binding us, by an unjust and unchristian use of power and a host of advantages which the possession of capital and superior knowledge furnishes. . . .[100]

The theme was repeated two years later on the Fourth of July by New England textile workers who wanted to call their proposed general strike "a second Independence Day."[101] In 1860, shoemakers in Lynn began their walkout on George Washington's birthday, calling their strike "sacred to the memory of one of the greatest men the world has ever produced."[102] In a contemporary engraving of the famous strike, the female binders who led the procession carried a banner which read:

American Ladies Will Not
Be Slaves
Give Us A Fair Compensation
And We Will Labour Cheerfully[103]

Seamstresses and tailoresses, women "engaged in obtaining a livlihood by use of the needle,"[104] were the most numerous and poorly paid group of women workers. When the needle trade took hold in the 1830's, the average weekly wage was $1.25, one to two dollars below the average of cotton mill operatives. The women, many of whom sewed at home, worked under the constant threat of losing their jobs to convicts or to wretchedly poor immigrants. The women who glutted the sewing industry were themselves a threat to male journeymen. Although many of their ready-made articles did not compete with the tailored clothing made by men, women were still capable of doing the men's work. This was obvious to the men, and they encouraged women to organize.

The earliest union of tailoresses was organized in New England by Lavinia Waight in 1825, when sixteen hundred women struck to demand a specific wage scale. Unionization in the needle trade peaked in the mid-thirties in Baltimore, New York and Philadelphia. In 1833 a short-lived union was formed at Fells Point, Maryland. The United Seamstresses of Baltimore appeared two years later, along with a United Men and Women's Trading Society. New York women organized in 1836, but the most unusual association existed in Philadelphia, where in 1835 seamstresses formed the Female Improvement Society of the City and County of Philadelphia. The organization was unique, a federation that encompassed women in the needle trades, female shoe binders, milliners, mantua makers, and women from several other industries. Wage lists for each trade were presented to the employers, and the increases apparently granted without resorting to a strike.[105]

The manufacture of cigars was another area in which women competed with men for jobs. Originally a home industry for farmers' wives, cigarmaking became a predominantly male occupation in the 1830's. Unions existed in most major northeastern cities. When Philadelphia cigarmakers went on strike in 1835, they asked the women to join them, "thereby making it a mutual interest with both parties to sustain each other in their rights."[106] This mutual interest, however, was actually self-interest. As an 1835 pamphlet pointed out, the wages "received by the females engaged in segar making is far below a fair compensation for the labor rendered."[107] A committee report to the National Trades Union, which met in Philadelphia in 1836, concisely stated the consequence. "Of fifty-eight societies, twenty-four are seriously affected by female labour, to the impovershing [*sic.*] of whole families, and benefit none but the employers."[108] Cigarmakers, printers, tailors and shoemakers all suffered. The report pointed out that "When the females are found capable of performing duty generally performed by the men, as a natural consequence, from the cheapness of their habits and dependent situation, they acquire complete control of that particular branch of labour."[109] In her 1836 Letters on the Equality of Women, Sarah Grimke emphasized the oppression of working women:

> A man who is engaged in teaching, can always, I believe, command a higher price for tuition than a woman -- even when he teaches the same branches, and is not in any respect superior to the woman. This I know is the case . . . in every occupation in which the sexes engage indiscriminately. As for example, in tailoring, a man has twice, or three times as much for making a waistcoat or pantaloons as a woman, although the work done by each may be equally good. In those employments which are peculiar to women, their time is estimated at only half the value of that of men.[110]

It was precisely because women's labor was cheaper that several industries in the thirties were compelled to foster the organization of women. Unionized women would thus be obligated to work for the standard wage. However impressive the record seems, these early unions were all tenuous. Most organizations only lasted through one or two strikes. Even the stronger ones, including the men's unions, were shattered by the panic in 1837.

The next important phase of labor organization to affect women occurred in the 1850's. During the prosperous years from 1850-1856, labor panaceas such as cooperation and agrarian reform gave way to hard wage bargaining. Most trades, like the United Order of Manufacturing Jewelers, were determined to "transform the [existing] Society into a Trade Union on a permanent basis."[111] Union constitutions defined specific criteria for membership, including only journeymen who were fully trained. As part of this concerted drive to form exclusive unions and win higher wages, certain trades began to deal harshly with female competitors. Non-union women were often hired as strikebreakers, or simply worked for a much lower wage than men. Printers, shoemakers and tailors dealt directly with this threat by excluding women from unions. The 1850 constitution of the journeymen cordwainers union, for instance, stipulated that no women were to be allowed in union shops "except she be a member's wife or daughter." Even then, the male relative had to assume responsibility for the woman's actions.[112] For the next two decades male unions vacillated between outright rejection of female union members and acceptance of their unionization as a means of eliminating cheap labor.

Between 1860 and 1869 twenty-four national trade unions were formed, along with William Sylvis' National Labor Union (NLU). Sylvis told an 1864 convention that woman "was created to be the presiding deity of the home circle." The reality of the working woman, however, had to be acknowledged. "Being forced into the field, the factory, and the workshop, . . ." said Sylvis, "they come in direct competition with men in the great field of labor; and being compelled of necessity, from their defenceless condition, to work for low wages, they exercise a vast influence over the price of labor in almost every department."[113] When the NLU held its first convention in 1866, delegates pledged their "undivided support" to factory workers and "sewing women."[114] This oft-quoted resolution, despite its outwardly admirable sentiment, was a policy position forced on the union because of the glut of poorly paid women on the job market. Sylvis explained the situation in 1867 to Boston workingmen:

> Rest assured, gentlemen, we cannot go forward without marching hand-in-hand with woman. If we leave her behind, capital will not be slow to unsex her, and place her in many of those channels of labor now occupied by us. She must have the same inducements, and derive equal benefit from the reform we are striving to accomplish, to make ourselves secure. We are bound to extricate her from her present depressed condition from motives of humanity as well as policy. It will be fatal to the cause of labor, when we place the sexes in competition, and jeopardize those social relations which render woman queen of the household. Keep her in the sphere which God designed her to fill. . . .[115]

Sylvis was thus compelled to call for a labor alliance between men and women, but this NLU expedient was not buttressed by radical social convictions concerning the rights of women. In one of his early editorial essays in the Iron Moulders International Journal, Sylvis discussed "Female Suffrage."

> Stop, gentle reader! Don't throw up your hands and roll up your eyes in holy horror, as you exclaim, "What! the Journal in favor of women voting?". . .
>
> We do love the ladies, and the dear creatures must not blame us for what we cannot help. It is our love for them that prompts us to condemn the follies and extravagances of the present day, which go far to undermine health and morals, if they do not, to a great extent, divest her of all that a good man holds dear. . . . We say it is because we love them, that we venture upon this short homily as a prelude to our answers. . . .
>
> Shall women vote? We answer yes. We are in favor of limited female suffrage. We think our wives, sisters, and daughters should have a vote on all questions involving a moral issue. Upon all laws relating to Sunday labor, granting license to sell rum, the use of tobacco, a reduction of working hours, or any question intimately connected with the domestic and social happiness of women, they should have a vote. . . .
>
> Give to women the right to emancipate themselves from a bondage which such vices fasten upon them, and, our word for it, they will prove as potent in reforming society as they are efficient in bringing happiness to the domestic circle. . . .[116]

The Harbinger, a labor forum for agrarian reform and the Fourier philosophy, was clearly more radical on this question. In an 1845 article, L. W. Ryckman, president of the New England Workingmen's Association, demanded a "guarantee to all men, women, and children [of] education and employment, as matters of right, inherent and inalienable; and [of] social position based upon character, and not upon . . . accidental circumstances."[117] The Harbinger defined woman's rights not only as

> freedom to speak in public, to vote, or to do many other things which are of trifling importance in our eyes, but social freedom also, freedom from the bonds which do absolutely degrade them from the equal rank which is their right, and deprive them of their true position, their power to use the faculties which God has given them, for their own service and for the service of humanity. . . .[118]

Albert Brisbane, American proponent of the Fourierist philosophy, expressed similar sentiments of equality in the Harbinger. "Workingmen want . . . AN EQUITABLE DIVISION OF PROFITS," he said, "guaranteeing to every person -- man, woman and child, -- the fruit of his or her Labor and Skill."[119] The Harbinger, however, gave no practical support to unionization. Its aim was to substitute cooperation for competition, thus ending conflict between employer and worker. Such panaceas were rejected by women after the 1850's.

In the 1860's and 1870's women concentrated on organizing working womens' associations, protective associations (for employment and legal aid purposes), and bona fide trade unions. During this period, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony were encouraging women to unionize through their newspaper, the Revolution. Their efforts helped boost Augusta Lewis' Women's Typographical Union #1 into existence in 1868. Female shoemakers in Lynn formed their own union, as did the collarmakers and laundresses in Troy, New York. Each organization, dependent on the direction of one or two strong, articulate leaders, began with the hope that men would acknowledge their rights to equal pay and unionization, and cooperate fully. The experiences of Augusta Lewis, president of the lone Woman's Local Typographical Union #1, were not uncommon. The local was accepted by the national organization in 1869. When Lewis was elected its corresponding secretary she hoped "to add a link to the chain that would span the chasm that has heretofore divided the interests of the male and female printers."[120] The union of interests did not materialize. In 1871 Lewis vented her pent-up grievances to the national union:

> We refuse to take the men's situations when they are on strike, and when there is no strike if we ask for work in union offices we are told by union foremen 'that there are no conveniences for us.' We are ostracized in many offices because we are members of the union, and although the principle is right, disadvantages are so many that we cannot much longer hold together. . . . It is the general opinion of female compositors that they are more justly treated by what is termed 'rat' foremen, printers and employers than they are by union men.[121]

The Woman's Typographical Union #1 folded in 1878. The national organization, adopting the practice of the national cigarmakers union, refused to charter women's unions. Instead, women were admitted to the national unions on an individual basis, a practice which undercut their ability to organize independently and to develop articulate spokesmen. These early labor organizations, including the NLU, were so tenuous, so dependent on a few strong personalities, and so susceptible to the vagaries of an unstable economy, that they were bound to fail.

iv

The Industrial Revolution widened the existing gap between poorer working women and (white) middle class feminists. Like their more affluent counterparts, working women also cast their grievances in terms of the natural rights philosophy of the Declaration of Independence, viewed their oppression as slave-like, and recognized the power inherent in organization. Unlike the mainstream feminists, however, female factory operatives placed top priority on earning a living wage -- not on winning suffrage. At the organizational meeting of the Woman's Typographical Union, typesetter Augusta Lewis insistently told Elizabeth Stanton that her fellow workers must first be organized for "business purposes" and won over to suffrage later. To prematurely combine the two would bias the typesetters against a union associated with "short hair, bloomers and other vagaries." "Primary emphasis on feminism," notes one modern scholar, "seems to have been a luxury that only white, middle-class women have been able to afford."[122] Although antebellum feminists such as Frances Wright, Sarah Grimke, Lucy Stone, Elizabeth Stanton and Susan Anthony were concerned about the plight of working women, their primary focus was social and political rather than economic. Their other potential ally, male laborers, also failed to offer permanent support; and so working women remained in limbo between male unions and middle class feminism until the late nineteenth century.

Although female workers were never vociferous champions of equal suffrage early in the nineteenth century, their expanding economic roles and scattered organizational successes were still a part of the American woman's changing status. During the Civil War, for instance, women were increasingly drawn out of their homes and into the working force. War-related activities gave them their first experience in a national enterprise. As nurses, fund raisers, relief workers, and later as civil servants, woman's traditional spheres were continually recharted.

The Civil War also affected mainstream feminism. National women's rights conventions, for instance, were not held past 1861. Although operation of the organizational apparatus was suspended, American women did participate in other organizations that flourished in response to the war. Paramount here was the Sanitary Commission. Federally empowered to inspect union hospitals and camps, the Sanitary Commission established a complex bureaucracy to deal with the logistics of delivering medical supplies and food to the Union army. The National Woman's Loyal League, headed by Stanton, Anthony and Stone, provided invaluable practical experience, and was responsible for collecting 400,000 signatures on petitions supporting the 13th Amendment. One historian has called the Woman's League "an effective cloak for the woman's rights campaign, which in theory had been laid aside but not in fact, as witness a resolution adopted at the Loyal League's first meeting, to the effect that there should be equal rights for women as well as Negroes."[123] Nonetheless, the sharp prewar focus on the American woman's status was diffused by the imminent possibility of Negro emancipation. Indeed, if the Civil War were cast as a "war for freedom," not only might slaves be freed, but they would probably win the vote as well. This was a heady thought to those who for decades had dedicated their lives to achieving emancipation and equality for black men. Feminists expected that any proposed legislation granting suffrage to the Negro would also extend the vote to women. Considering the political climate at the end of the Civil War, this assumption was premature and naive.

The expectation of dual suffrage, however, seemed sound to American feminists. Not only was it compatible with the Garrisonian concept of universal emancipation, but it was also an integral part of the human rights philosophy that had been the cornerstone of woman's rights since the 1830's. Garrison, in supporting the enfranchisement of women during the thirties, had paraphrased the Declaration of Independence: "'All government derives its _just_ power from the _consent of the governed_.'"[124] Angelina Grimke, in her _Letters to Catherine Beecher_, had argued that lack of political power was a "_violation of human rights_." She also believed that the "ultimate result" of the "discussion of the rights of the slave . . . will certainly be, 'the breaking of _every_ yoke,' the letting the oppressed of _every_ grade and description go free. . . ."[125] These arguments had been absorbed into the developing feminist ideology, and thus formed part of the basis for the expectation of dual suffrage. Further, from a purely practical stance, the Loyal Leaguers believed that their efforts in supporting the Union and the Republican Party would later be rewarded with the vote. Their hope was in some ways similar to the American Negro's post-revolutionary expectation of freedom, to be granted by a grateful government in return for their military service. Just as many Negroes were intensely disappointed after that war for freedom, so were women profoundly disillusioned at the Civil War's end. The Stanton-Anthony faction was especially outraged that the Republican Party, "eyes fixed on a windfall of 2,000,000 potential male Negro voters," would not also adopt their cause. Their most bitter resentment was directed towards those abolitionists who, although they had fought for universal emancipation during the war, concentrated afterwards on winning freedom and civil rights solely for the Negro -- even though this meant abandoning feminist goals. To abolitionists like Wendell Phillips, Lucy Stone and Frederick Douglass, passage of the 14th and 15th Amendments could _not_ be jeopardized by the insistence that women also be given citizenship and the vote.[126] Supporters of Stanton and Anthony, however, viewed the division of the two struggles as ideologically inconsistent. Angelina Grimke Weld, who had quietly reentered public life during the 1850's, reiterated her long-held belief that woman's rights should be "identified with the Negro." Speaking at the convention which formed the Loyal League she stressed the idea that "until [the Negro] gets his rights, we shall never have ours." Although Angelina recognized that women "have not felt the slave-holders lash," she still believed that the civil rights of all oppressed groups were inextricably bound together. As she had once explained her philosophy to a friend:

> I recognize no rights but human rights. I know nothing of men's rights and women's rights. . . . I am persuaded that woman is not to be as she has been, a mere second-hand agent . . . but the acknowledged equal and co-worker with man. . . . This is part of the great doctrine of Human Rights, & can no more be separated from Emancipation than the light from the head of the sun; the rights of the slave and the woman blend.[127]

Other abolitionists, who felt that they must place top priority on the slave's struggle, believed that abolition could be achieved only by the realistic expedient of separating the two suffrage struggles. They were not as concerned with ideological inconsistency as they were with the possibility that a combined suffrage amendment would give legislators a new opportunity to postpone -- or defeat -- a bill for Negro enfranchisement. Frederick Douglass, a black abolitionist who had ardently supported Stanton's Seneca Falls resolution that women seek the vote, also pointed out another fundamental difference between the situations of women and Negroes:

> When women, because they are women, are dragged from their homes and hung upon lamp-posts; when their children are torn from their arms and their brains dashed to the pavement; when they are objects of insult and outrage at every turn; when they are in danger of having their homes burnt down over their heads; when their children are not allowed to enter schools; then they will have an urgency to obtain the ballot.

Lucy Stone and other female abolitionists also urged that passage of the 14th and 15th Amendments not be endangered by changing the wording of the amendment. "I will be grateful in my soul," said Stone, "if any body can get out of this terrible pit."[128]

The 14th Amendment was adopted in 1868; six months later the Radical Republicans introduced the 15th (suffrage) Amendment, which read, "The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied . . . on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Stanton and Anthony argued that it would have been so easy to have included the word "sex." Their assessment, however, was historically unfounded, for in a Congressional debate on woman suffrage two years earlier, the anti-suffrage element won resoundingly by arguing that women belonged in the home, or that through "their elevated social position, [women] can exercise more influence upon public affairs than they could coerce by the use of the ballot."[129] These attitudes, shared by a majority of Americans, had to be changed before political enfranchisement could be won.

The emerging rift between the Stanton-Anthony faction and the followers of Lucy Stone culminated in the formation of two separate women's organizations in 1869. In May of that year, Stanton and Anthony set up the National Woman Suffrage Association (NWSA) as an organization restricted solely to women, and with the express purpose of seeking a constitutional amendment giving women the vote. Six months later the American Woman Suffrage Association (AWSA) was organized. Headed by Lucy Stone, AWSA chose to win suffrage through changes in individual state laws. In a move that paralleled the 1840 action of moderate abolitionists, who had formed the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society in order to make their movement more acceptable to the average citizen, AWSA

> believed that [suffrage] could be won only by avoiding issues that were irrelevant and calculated to alienate the support of influential sections of the community. Its leaders had no interest in organizing working women, in criticizing the churches, or in the divorce question, certainly as matters of public discussion.[130]

The NWSA espoused a more radical philosophy. The vote was viewed as an important goal, but there were crucial underlying social issues to consider as well:

> . . . we know that the ballot when we get it, will achieve for woman no more than it has achieved for man. And to drop all other demands for the sake of uniting to demand the ballot only, may seem the whole duty of the Woman's Journal [organ of the AWSA], but it is only a very small part of the mission of the Revolution [organ of the NWSA]. The ballot is not even half the loaf; it is only a crust -- a crumb. The ballot touches only those interests, either of women or men, which take their root in political questions. But woman's chief discontent is not with her political, but with her social, and particularly her marital bondage. The solemn and profound question of marriage . . . is of more vital consequence to woman's welfare, reaches down to a deeper depth in woman's heart, and more thoroughly constitutes the core of the woman's movement, than any such superficial and fragmentary question as woman's suffrage.[131]

The two opposing factions, represented by the more respectable Woman's Journal and the radical Revolution, headquartered in different cities, and identified by distinct philosophies and tactics, attempted a reconciliation in 1870. It was a resounding failure. Although this split weakened organized support, the woman's movement nonetheless had a spirited, active postwar history.

The history of woman's rights and abolition intertwined in a variety of ways during the antebellum decades. Before the Grimkes inexorably injected the question of woman's rights into the public arena, there had been earlier, isolated attempts to call attention to the inequitable situation of women. It was their position as abolitionist lecturers, however, that provided the occasion for the Grimkes to provoke the woman question. Opposition to their full participation within the abolition movement (the furor over their public addresses, the rejection of female delegates to the World's Anti-Slavery Convention in 1840) provided further opportunities for assertions of equality. Women appropriated from abolition the human rights philosophy, adapting the Declaration of Independence to suit their own demand for an expanded definition of equality. The shared philosophical base was buttressed by the similar motivation of moral duty. Each movement was bolstered by revivalism, each sought moral improvement, each was optimistic that "right causes" would eventually succeed. Leaders of both movements had to "fight the Bible," and in the literature of woman's rights and abolition there is a pronounced emphasis on gleaning Biblical passages to support their respective causes. Early abolition also provided the fledgling woman's rights movement with a majority of its leaders. The Grimkes, Susan Anthony, Stanton and Stone, Abby Kelley, Lucretia Mott and Maria Weston Chapman all began as abolitionists. Abolition also supported woman's rights in other tangible ways. For instance, it was Oberlin College, founded by the Lane rebels, that became the first such institution to admit women. Abolitionist newspapers, the Liberator in particular, reprinted most of the early pamphlets and letters written by the Grimkes. Woman's rights also patterned its organization after abolition's. They persistently petitioned Congress, formed national associations based on local auxillaries, held conventions and printed newspapers, and avidly sought to influence public opinion by means of the lecture circuit. It was this practical experience, absorbed by female abolitionists, that gave structure to their own movement.

The moderate abolitionists, unlike their more radical colleagues, constituted a stumbling block in the path of the nascent woman's rights movement. Despite this fact, there were other obstacles to a sustained momentum. Conservative clergy, as witnessed in the Pastoral Letter, were intent on keeping the American woman within her circumscribed sphere. The obstinate conservatism of early nineteenth century social attitudes was, of course, an additional hindrance; but it was the constraints of marriage and family that prevented many women from concentrating their efforts on the woman question. It was marriage and homemaking, for instance, that removed two key feminists from the scene at a critical juncture: Angelina and Sarah Grimke.

Feminism's association with abolition and the slavery question had been a checkered experience. However, women did gain organizational and tactical knowledge within the abolitionist framework, and also adopted abolition's ideological underpinnings. Closely tied to the abolitionist movement during the 1830's, advocates of woman's rights began to pursue an independent course after the 1840 AASS split and the 1840 World's Anti-Slavery Convention. Those two events dramatized the need for women to organize for their own benefit, and between 1848 and 1861 a small but devoted group of American women did just that. The Civil War, as well as the postwar focus on freedmen's rights, prompted most women to view their situation in terms of universal emancipation. But by 1870, when the 15th Amendment was passed without having legalized female suffrage, women were again pursuing a separate course that eventually led to enfranchisement. Their ideological development and organizational abilities, however, were grounded in their movement's antebellum past.

NOTES: CHAPTER III

[1] This skeleton outline of the woman's rights movement can be filled in by reading one of the general histories, such as Eleanor Flexner, *Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959). William O'Neill, in his introduction to *Everyone Was Brave: The Rise and Fall of Feminism in America* (Chicago, 1969), defines the accepted terminology of the movement. In this thesis the term feminism will be employed as a synonym for woman's rights. The term "woman's movement" will be used to describe "the entire complex of woman's activities" (O'Neill, p. x), including the fight for equal social, political and economic rights. It should be noted as well that by ideology I mean the ideas, assertions, theories and aims that characterized the woman's movement. There was no systematic adoption of a rigid program or structured philosophy by early feminists. Most historians of antebellum reform, including Alice Tyler, recognize that abolition helped to focus attention on woman's rights. Tyler's analysis of the relationship does mention that women "learned valuable lessons in the business of organization and propaganda," *Freedom's Ferment*, p. 445; but she does not believe that the relationship between abolition and women's rights was positive. Craven does not deal with woman's rights in *Coming of the Civil War*. He mentions the Grimke sisters once, on p. 146: "[James] Birney, the Grimke sisters, Frederick Douglass, and many others influenced the [abolition] movement and were influenced by it in a way comparable only to the relation of reformed drunkards to the temperance cause."

[2] The estimate of female antislavery members can be found in Page Smith, *Daughters of the Promised Land: Women in American History* (Boston, 1970), p. 111. Although every general history of the woman movement deals with the interaction of feminism and abolition, Alma Lutz, *Crusade for Freedom: Women of the Antislavery Movement* (Boston, 1968) concentrates solely on this topic. According to Angelina Grimke in her *Appeal to the Christian Women of the South* (New York: American Anti-Slavery Society, [1837]), p. 23, there were 60 female antislavery societies in operation by 1836. This copy of the *Appeal* can be found in the open stacks at Haverford College library.

[3] This idea is expressed by Lillian O'Connor in *Pioneer Women Orators: Rhetoric in the Ante-Bellum Reform Movement* (New York, 1954), and is supported by a variety of primary sources quoted by O'Connor, pp. 178-179.

[4] Angelina Grimke, *Letters to Catherine E. Beecher, in reply to An Essay on Slavery and Abolitionism, addressed to A. E. Grimke*, letter 12, (Boston: Isaac Knapp, 1838), p. 114. This particular copy of the *Letters to Catherine Beecher* is located in the Quaker Collection at the Haverford College library. In her address to the first National Woman's Rights Convention in 1850, Paulina Wright Davis also spoke of

natural rights: "The first principles of human rights have now for a long time been abstractly held and believed. . . . Equality before the law, and the right of the governed to choose their governors, are established maxims . . . but . . . they are yet denied to Woman. . . ." See Davis' keynote address, National Woman's Rights Convention, The Proceedings of the Woman's Rights Convention, Held at Worcester, October 23d and 24th, 1850 (Boston, 1851), p. 8. This copy of the proceedings is in the Schlesinger Library at Radcliffe College.

[5] Angelina Grimke, Appeal to the Christian Women of the South, p. 2.

[6] Quoted in Branch, Sentimental Years, p. 217. A specific application of Hunt's complaint was that women were taxed to support educational facilities to which they did not have full access. See O'Connor, Pioneer Women Orators, p. 183. Another of Hunt's protests is reprinted in Aileen S. Kraditor, ed., Up From the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of Feminism (Chicago, 1968), pp. 228-230.

[7] Quoted in O'Neill, Everyone Was Brave, p. 10.

[8] In Alice S. Rossi, ed., The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir (New York, 1973), p. 287, John Greenleaf Whittier is quoted as asking how the Grimkes could forget "the great and dreadful wrongs of the slave in a selfish crusade against some paltry grievance . . . some trifling oppression, political or social, of their own." Rossi suggests (p. 288) that Weld was more enthusiastic about Angelina's speaking than was Garrison, and that Weld was simply more open about his reservations. She tentatively supports the view that Garrison was "an opportunist, who supported woman's rights in public as one moral issue he could use to agitate and assert leadership."

[9] The Grimkes did not begin their lecture tour in order to stir up controversy over "the woman question" (as it was later called); but once the issue was raised, the sisters committed themselves intensely and fully to this facet of human rights.

[10] Quoted in Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860," Am. Q. 18 (summer, 1966), p. 171. The ensuing discussion of the true woman follows this article and draws also from information in Barbara Welter, "Anti-Intellectualism and the American Woman: 1800-1860," Mid-America 48 (1966): 258-270.

[11] Furnas, The Americans, p. 487.

[12] Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood," p. 174.

[13] The Blackstone quote can be found in Wish, Society and Thought in Early America, p. 416. On the legal status of women, see Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, p. 426 or O'Connor, Pioneer Women Orators, p. 16.

[14] Quoted in Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, p. 428.

[15] Quoted in Stewart H. Holbrook, Dreamers of the American Dream (Garden City, N. Y., 1957), p. 173. For an account of Wright's 1828 speech, see O'Connor, Pioneer Women Orators, p. 4.

[16] Women faced similar discrimination in the temperance movement. O'Neill, Everyone Was Brave, pp. 4-5, makes the distinction between the immediate cause of feminism (unequal treatment within the abolition movement), and the underlying economic changes which gave women more leisure time. However, women did not always use their free time in a radical way. For instance, although many became involved in feminist literary pursuits, others channeled such efforts into ladies magazines which were dedicated to maintaining woman's exalted image. See Bertha-Monica Stearns, "Reform Periodicals and Female Reformers, 1830-1860," AHR (1931-1932): 678-699. As well, the growth of industry forced many women into low-paying factory jobs, widening the gap between rich (or middle class) women, and their poorer counterparts. Kraditor, in Up From the Pedestal, p. 14, also discusses leisure time, its causes, and the uses to which it was put. The situation of working women will be dealt with later in this chapter.

[17] Quoted in Lutz, Crusade for Freedom, p. 21.

[18] The free produce movement is discussed in Dwight Lowell Dumond, Antislavery: The Crusade for Freedom in America (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1961), pp. 350-351.

[19] Mott's quote is reprinted in Lutz, Crusade for Freedom, p. 52. The formation of the AASS and the PFAS is dealt with on pp. 46-53.

[20] Participation of women in early abolitionist societies is the focus of ibid., chaps. 3-8. The Grimkes are discussed in chaps. 5-8. The contribution of the women to the petition campaign is documented in Smith, Daughters of the Promised Land, p. 111. The mobbing of the BFAS is mentioned by Angelina Grimke in her Appeal to the Christian Women of the South, p. 23.

[21] See note 56, below, concerning these conversions.

[22] Angelina Grimke, Appeal to the Christian Women of the South, p. 29.

[23] Sarah Grimke, Epistle to the Clergy of the Southern States ([New York], 1836), p. 18. This copy of Sarah's Epistle is in the open stacks at the Haverford College library.

[24] Angelina Grimke, Appeal to the Christian Women of the South, p. 24.

[25] Angelina Grimke, Letters to Catherine Beecher, p. 126.

[26] Sarah Grimke, Epistle to the Clergy of the Southern States, p. 18.

[27] Angelina Grimke, Letters to Catherine Beecher, p. 13.

[28] Quoted in Gerda Lerner, Grimke Sisters from South Carolina, p. 52. The biographical information on the Grimkes is extracted from this source, especially chaps. 1-16. The exchange of letters between Angelina and Theodore Weld concerning the tactical and ideological plausibility of linking abolition with woman's rights can be found in Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, vols. 1 and 2, pp. 411-539. Lutz, Crusade for Freedom, chaps. 5-8, gives a condensed version of the Grimkes' connection with abolition and the woman's movement. Katherine DuPre Lumpkin's biography of Angelina, The Emancipation of Angelina Grimke (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1974), complements both Lerner's study and the Weld-Grimke correspondence by focusing on Angelina's married years, a thirty year period of Mrs. Weld's life largely ignored by other historians.

[29] Quoted in Smith, Daughters of the Promised Land, p. 104.

[30] Quoted in Lerner, Grimke Sisters from South Carolina, pp. 123-124.

[31] Ibid., p. 125.

[32] Quoted in ibid., p. 132. The sisters' abolitionist sentiments were later reinforced when they met a group of Rhode Island Quakers who were also active abolitionists. See pp. 133-134 for details on this 1836 encounter.

[33] Angelina's decision to act was made overnight (see ibid., p. 138), and was similar to the religious conversion or sudden catharsis that characterized many other reformers' commitments.

[34] Angelina Grimke, Appeal to the Christian Women of the South, p. 16. The Appeal was publicly burned in her hometown of Charleston. Angelina pointed out on p. 17 of her open letter that southern women need only read the Bible and the Declaration of Independence as sources of antislavery thought. "It is all one," she wrote, "for our books and papers are mostly commentaries on the Bible, and the Declaration."

[35] These short quotations are all from ibid., pp. 16-18.

[36] Weld had lost his speaking voice by 1837. He and Angelina married in 1838. Their marital years are discussed in the conclusion, n. 26, below.

[37] Quoted in Lerner, Grimke Sisters from South Carolina, p. 153. The audiences, however, were always large -- and attentive. For an account of the Grimkes' Poughkeepsie speech see p. 159.

[38] Angelina to Theodore, May 18, 1837 in Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 388.

[39] Quoted in Lerner, Grimke Sisters from South Carolina, pp. 161-162. In 1836 Sarah had published her first abolitionist tract, Epistle to the Clergy of the Southern States, p. 155.

[40] Quoted in Lutz, Crusade for Freedom, p. 104. Angelina defended the right of women to discuss politics during her New York tour. See ibid., p. 155.

[41] Quoted in ibid., p. 155. Lerner, Grimke Sisters from South Carolina, p. 163, comments that, "More than anyone else, the two new female agents symbolized in their person the newly won unity of the various factions and trends in the cause. Members of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, they had been discovered by Garrison, trained by Weld, launched by the American Anti-Slavery Society. There was every reason to believe that their agency would be a unifying force."

[42] Quoted in Lerner, Grimke Sisters from South Carolina, p. 169. From this point on, Sarah's interest in the working woman grew, perhaps from contact with the female working force that manufactured shoes in Lynn, Massachusetts.

[43] Gerrit Smith did not approve of the Grimkes' public speaking, although abolitionist Samuel May overcame his doubts and even allowed the sisters to lecture from his pulpit. For May's reactions see Lutz, Crusade for Freedom, p. 106. The responses of other male abolitionists are covered in the text of this chapter, above.

[44] Angelina Grimke, Letters to Catherine Beecher, p. 119.

[45] Ibid., pp. 115-119.

[46] Ibid., p. 126.

[47] Reprinted in Rossi, The Feminist Papers, p. 305.

[48] Reprinted in Flexner, Century of Struggle, pp. 46-47. Maria Weston Chapman's rebuttal, in the form of a satirical poem poking fun at the clergy's position, is quoted on pp. 48-49. The Pastoral Letter caused many ministers to close their churches to the Grimkes and to other abolitionists, but the Letter did not prevent the success of the sisters' remaining New England lectures.

[49] Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 411 and 412.

[50] Ibid., p. 418. The two previous quotes are on p. 416 and p. 415.

[51] Ibid., p. 425.

[52] Ibid., pp. 425-427. Weld consistently restated his position during this period of correspondence with Angelina and Sarah. The most important letters concerning the woman question run from July, 1837, to February, 1838.

[53] Lerner, *Grimke Sisters from South Carolina*, p. 199. The preceding quote by Angelina can be found in ibid., p. 428.

[54] Barnes and Dumond, *Weld-Grimke Letters*, 1: 430.

[55] Ibid., pp. 429-431. This letter was also addressed to John Greenleaf Whittier, who at Weld's behest had urged the sisters to desist from raising the topic of woman's rights because it meant "abandoning in some degree the cause of the poor and miserable slave. . . ." See Whittier's letter on pp. 423-424, and his stinging admonition quoted in n. 8, above. The correspondence between Weld and Angelina continued for several more months. Sarah was a frequent contributor to this exchange, occasionally writing her own letters to Weld, and always adding a few lines to Angelina's letters. See the entries in Barnes and Dumond, *Weld-Grimke Letters*, 1: 432-510 and 2: 512-530. The next letter from Weld to Angelina (February 8, 1838, 2: 532-536), and Angelina's reply (February 11, 1838, 2: 536-539), contained their declarations of love to each other. They were baffled and confused that their feelings for one another had moved beyond brotherly-sisterly affection, but they quickly mastered their misgivings and married in May, 1838. See their letters, 2: 540-677, passim.

[56] See Lerner, *Grimke Sisters from South Carolina*, p. 203. Lerner has estimated audience size and the number of converts on pp. 226-229, p. 420 n. 1, and p. 421 n. 2.

[57] Quoted in Lutz, *Crusade for Freedom*, pp. 129-130. Lutz deals with the legislative and Odeon speeches in chap. 8. Lerner, ibid., p. 233, reprints some of the glowing comments and reviews of Angelina's Odeon lectures, including high praise from one of the century's most acclaimed orators, Wendell Phillips.

[58] There is a paucity of information concerning the burning of Pennsylvania Hall. Lutz, ibid., pp. 137-144, discusses it briefly as does Lerner, *Grimke Sisters from South Carolina*, chap. 15. The account here follows J. Thomas Scharf and Thompson Westcott, *History of Philadelphia: 1609-1884*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: L. H. Everis & Co., 1884), 3: 650-652. The Scharf-Westcott account is very detailed, and does not always agree with Lerner's version.

[59] Quoted in Lerner, Grimke Sisters from South Carolina, p. 246. The Pennsylvania Hall speeches by Angelina Grimke Weld and Abby Kelley are reprinted in Elizabeth Cady Stanton et al., eds., History of Woman Suffrage, 6 vols. (New York, 1886-1922; reprint ed., New York, 1969), 1: 334-337.

[60] Acting as the corresponding secretary of the Lynn, Massachusetts Female Anti-Slavery Society, Kelley was writing to Mary Grew, her counterpart at the PFAS. Kelley's letter of March 16, 1838, is located in the Correspondence of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, Pennsylvania Abolition Society Collection (microfilm publication), Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1976. In the same letter, Kelley also urged that "Notices of the [woman's rights] convention, stressing its importance upon the consideration of our country women, will find a place in every anti-slavery paper, that a goodly number may be [present]."

[61] The emphasis on "members" is mine. O'Connor, Pioneer Women Orators, amplifies this point on pp. 32-34, where the account of Kelley's nomination is also discussed. Also see the Liberator, May 22, 1840. The broader aspects of the 1840 split are discussed in chap. I above.

[62] William Lloyd Garrison, The Words of Garrison, edited by Wendell Phillips Garrison and Francis Jackson Garrison (Boston, 1905), pp. 46-47. Also see Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 438. Other male abolitionists who encouraged an ideological and organizational link between woman's rights and abolition were Henry C. Wright, Wendell Phillips, Samuel May, James Mott and Frederick Douglass.

[63] Lewis Tappan to Weld, May 26, 1840, in Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 836.

[64] Douglas H. Maynard, "The World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840," MVHR 47 (1960), p. 457. Maynard lists the female delegates on pp. 456-457. The following discussion of the WASC is based primarily on Maynard.

[65] Quoted in ibid., p. 458.

[66] Stanton, History of Woman Suffrage, 1: 62 and 61.

[67] O'Connor, Pioneer Women Orators, p. 42, lists twenty-seven prominent female orators, the date and topic of each one's first speech, and the number of extant texts of their speeches given before 1861.

[68] Holbrook, Dreamers of the American Dream, p. 178.

[69] See Branch, Sentimental Years, pp. 216-217. Massachusetts, for instance, eased its divorce laws. In Vermont (by 1847) a wife retained her real estate at marriage, but needed her husband's consent to sell it. O'Connor, Pioneer Women Orators, p. 19, and Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, p. 460, also discuss legal advances attained during the 1840's.

[70] Quoted in Flexner, Century of Struggle, pp. 74-75. Flexner, in her opening speech at the 3d Berkshire Conference on the History of Women (June 9, 1976, at Bryn Mawr College), told the audience that the building in Seneca Falls where the momentous meeting was held in 1848, is currently a laundromat.

[71] Quoted in Holbrook, Dreamers of the American Dream, p. 182. The Seneca Falls meeting is discussed in chap. 3.

[72] Stanton, History of Woman Suffrage, 1: 216.

[73] Davis, keynote address, Proceedings of the Woman's Rights Convention of 1850, pp. 6-7. Davis lists the members of the convention on pp. 80-84. Stanton, ibid., notes that the first conventions were not advertised or planned, but were well attended because they were a curiosity. The editors of History of Woman Suffrage feel that the Massachusetts conventions were "well considered" because there were so many Massachusetts abolitionists interested in woman's rights.

[74] Ibid., p. 10.

[75] Ibid., p. 7.

[76] Quoted in Branch, Sentimental Years, pp. 211-212.

[77] Quoted in ibid., p. 212. Holbrook discusses legal developments in Dreamers of the American Dream, p. 186, and deals with the careers of Brown and Blackwell on pp. 182-183. The annual conventions are also dealt with in O'Connor, Pioneer Women Orators, pp. 38-39, where women's oratorical abilities are stressed. O'Connor also documents press reaction to the delegates' speeches.

[78] Wendell Phillips, Speeches, Letters, and Lectures, 1st ser. ([Boston], 1884; reprint ed., New York, 1968), p. 17. On p. 31 Phillips warned that the market was glutted with female laborers, and that woman was "ground down by the competition of her sisters. . . ."

[79] Reprinted in O'Connor, Pioneer Women Orators, p. 38, n. 110. O'Connor quotes similar comments on p. 39. Also see Holbrook, Dreamers of the American Dream, pp. 184-185.

[80] See n. 1, above, concerning the ideology of the woman's rights movement.

[81] See Edith Abbott, Women in Industry (New York, 1913), p. 70, for a list of these occupations. In addition to Abbott, other secondary sources which deal with women in industry include Commons, History of Labour in the United States, passim.; Herbert G. Gutman, Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History (New York, 1976); Flexner, Century of Struggle, chap. 9; and general labor histories. For the estimates of the numbers of working women see Branch, Sentimental Years, p. 212; Flexner, Century of Struggle, p. 131; and Gerda Lerner, The Woman in American History (Menlo Park, Calif., 1971), p. 50.

[82] The National Gazette (Providence, R. I.), June 10, 1824, quoted in Dulles, Labor in America, p. 32.

[83] In Fall River, Massachusetts, another system developed. Entire families were hired to tend looms, working conditions (especially in the 1820's) were generally worse than at Lowell, and there was no paternalistic supervision of employees. See Commons, History of Labour in the United States, pp. 172-173. Commons notes that the work week at Lowell averaged seventy-three and a half hours. In 1831, women comprised 58.1 percent of mill operatives in the New England and middle Atlantic states. Lowell mills in 1834 employed fifteen hundred men and forty-five hundred women.

[84] Furnas, The Americans, p. 477.

[85] See, for instance, Dulles, Labor in America, p. 75.

[86] Ibid., p. 76.

[87] Sarah Bagley, quoted in Edward T. James, ed., Notable American Women, 1607-1950, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), 1: 81.

[88] The Voice of Industry, September 25, 1846, quoted in Norman Ware, The Industrial Worker, 1840-1860: The Reaction of American Industrial Society to the Advance of the Industrial Revolution (Chicago, 1964), p. 91.

[89] Quoted in Flexner, Century of Struggle, p. 55.

[90] Ibid.

[91] The Harbinger, August 30, 1845.

[92] Quoted from the Voice of Industry, February 13, 1846, in Commons, History of Labour in the United States, p. 539. See pp. 540-546 for a summary of the efforts to legislate the ten hour day. New Hampshire, in 1847, was the first state to pass a ten hour law. Ware devotes chap. 8 of The Industrial Worker to this movement.

[93] Flexner, Century of Struggle, p. 56.

[94] Quoted in Ware, The Industrial Worker, p. 90.

[95] According to James, Notable American Women, 1: 82, Bagley in 1846 "took a job as superintendent of the newly opened Lowell telegraph office, thereby becoming, it is said, the nation's first woman telegraph operator. . . . Thereafter she drops from the public record."

[96] See the figures in Abbott, Women in Industry, pp. 156-158.

[97] Lynn Record, January 8, 1834, quoted in Commons, History of Labour in the United States, p. 356.

[98] Taft, Organized Labor in American History, p. 28.

[99] See Commons, History of Labour in the United States, pp. 442-443.

[100] The Awl (Lynn, Massachusetts), August 14, 1844, quoted in Ware, The Industrial Worker, p. 42. In another 1844 article, a shoemaker wrote, "We are slaves in the strictest sense of the word. For do we not have to toil from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same for our masters -- aye, masters, and for our daily bread?"

[101] Quoted in Gutman, Work, Culture and Society, p. 51.

[102] Quoted in ibid.

[103] Quoted from the banner pictured in Lerner, The Woman in American History, p. 51.

[104] Quoted in Commons, History of Labour in the United States, pp. 353-354. Wages are discussed on p. 354.

[105] Commons, ibid., p. 355, says that after this success in winning a higher wage the federation "soon after went to pieces."

[106] Quoted in ibid., p. 343.

[107] Proceedings of the Government and Citizens of Philadelphia on the Reduction of the Hours of Labor and Increase of Wages (Boston, 1835 pamphlet), quoted in ibid.

[108] Report to the National Trades' Union Convention of 1836, quoted in Dulles, Labor in America, pp. 54-56.

[109] Quoted in Commons, History of Labour in the United States, p. 436.

[110] Reprinted in Rossi, The Feminist Papers, p. 313.

[111] New York Tribune, May 8, 1850, quoted in Commons, History of Labour in the United States, p. 579.

[112] Quoted in ibid., p. 596.

[113] Quoted in Flexner, Century of Struggle, p. 119.

[114] Quoted in ibid., p. 132.

[115] Sylvis, Life and Speeches of William H. Sylvis, p. 220.

[116] Ibid., pp. 398-399.

[117] The Harbinger, June 21, 1845.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Ibid., October 4, 1845. In the same issue, the Harbinger called the women abolitionists of Boston "slaves! Many of them do not bear their own names, but are called by the names of their legal masters; they are in a state of perpetual minority, and cannot dispose of anything which belongs to them, not even the products of their own labor. . . . We call, then, upon the noble women who now use their efforts for the liberation of the chattel slave, to turn their attention to their own condition, . . . assuring them that they can do nothing efficiently for the freedom of others until they are themselves free."

[120] President's Report, 19th Convention, International Typographers Union (1871), p. 12, quoted in Flexner, Century of Struggle, p. 136.

[121] Quoted in ibid., The Account of Augusta Lewis and the typographers union is based on Flexner's chap. 9, "Women in the Trade Unions, 1860-1875."

[122] Kraditor, Up From the Pedestal, p. 15. The Lewis-Stanton exchange is reprinted in Flexner, Century of Struggle, p. 134. Susan Anthony, although she encouraged women to organize and was a delegate to an early National Labor Congress, urged women to act as strikebreakers. She also allowed the Revolution to be printed in an office that paid below the union scale. See O'Neill, Everyone was Brave, p. 20. Taft, however, in Organized Labor in American History, p. 63, reports that Sylvis' NLU in 1868 recognized the Revolution "as entitled to full support." Kraditor, p. 72, reprints an early speech by Lucy Stone in which Stone talks about the low wages paid to women.

[123] Holbrook, Dreamers of the American Dream, p. 187. Flexner, Century of Struggle, deals with the status of women during the Civil War in chap. 6.

[124] See n. 62, above.

[125] See n. 44 and n. 46, above.

[126] Quoted in Flexner, Century of Struggle, p. 142. The 13th Amendment (1865) made slavery illegal in the United States. See the U. S. Const. amend. XIII, Sec. 1. The 14th Amendment (1868) read in part: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States . . . are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. . . ." See the U. S. Const. amend. XIV, Sec. 1. The 15th Amendment, is quoted on p. 162, below.

[127] Quoted in Lumpkin, Emancipation of Angelina Grimke, p. 204. The preceding quotes by Angelina are reprinted in Stanton, History of Woman Suffrage 2: 60-61. Her speech before the Loyal League is in 2: 54-56. Angelina was not an active Stanton-Anthony supporter, and had opposed formal organization of the woman's movement in 1852. (See Lumpkin, p. 206). Her support of the woman's rights movement during the 1850's and 1860's took the form of self-motivated individual acts, such as her march to the polls on an election day in the late 1860's, a symbolic gesture of protest. Kraditor, in Up from the Pedestal, pp. 8-9, reprints part of a letter to Weld (January 7, 1838) in which Angelina again expressed her ideas on the position of the American woman. She described to her fiancee a lyceum debate on the proposition, "Would the condition of woman and of society be improved by placing the two sexes on an equality with respect to civil rights and duties?" She exploded to Weld: "There are lords & masters undertook to discuss our rights & settle what was most for our benefit, but we were not permitted to plead our own cause, nor were we called upon to give our votes[.] As well might the Slaveholders of the So[uth] hold a meeting to discuss whether the condition of Society & the slaves would be improved by emancipation, whilst they sat gagged before them & the question decided by acclamation by the masters without the voice of the slaves."

[128] Quoted in Flexner, Century of Struggle, p. 145. The Douglass quote can be found on p. 144.

[129] Quoted in ibid., p. 148. The preceding quote is also located on that page. The 15th Amendment is quoted from the U. S. Const. amend. XV, Sec. 1.

[130] Ibid., p. 153.

[131] Quoted in O'Neill, Everyone Was Brave, pp. 19-20.

Conclusion: The War Years and Beyond

1

The Civil War was a tumultuous, changeful experience for America, an event defined both by the quantitative reality of blood and battles, and by the immeasurable changes in postwar attitudes, ideas, and social and economic conditions. Since the war began historians and social critics have argued about its causes, aims and effects. The overwhelming emphasis has been on the changes wrought by the war, with most historians concluding that it marked a near-total break with the past. Only very recently have some scholars indicated that links exist between the antebellum past and the era of Reconstruction and the Gilded Age.

The standard view of the Civil War divides the nineteenth century into halves, but this separation suggests a truncated vision of the mid-nineteenth century. The ideas, movements and cultural climate of the antebellum era are left dangling, and the postwar period is invariably explained in terms of the immediate changes visible at the war's end. If reference is made to antebellum antecedents, it is usually in a negative way. The two halves of the century are set off against each other, "the humanitarian philosophy of enlightenment, perfectibility, democracy, beside the philosophy of acquisition, laissez-faire, gratuitous benevolence."[1] Henry James wrote that the "Civil War mark[ed] an era in the history of the

American mind," and transcendentalist Orestes Brownson believed that Enlightenment ideals ended with the firing on Fort Sumter.[2] Modern historians echo these contemporaries by viewing the Civil War as a "watershed" in intellectual terms as well as on the political and economic levels. The Civil War, say many historians, marked the end of the evangelical era, the end of humanitarian reform, and caused the disappearance of Romanticism.[3]

There were, of course, undeniable, dramatically noticeable changes in the 1860's and 1870's. Darwin and Comte sledgehammered a wedge between science and religion, and the authority of the conservative clergy was eroded by the expertise of a scientific and technological elite. Postwar America was dominated by manipulators of capital and credit, which in turn became the underpinnings of a greedy and aggressive materialism. A concomitant war legacy was growth and organization. Economic expansion was everywhere evident and the government, transformed by the necessity of maintaining an army, blossomed not only in the bureaucratic sense, but also gained a new authority comensurate with its burgeoning responsibilities. Organization on a grand scale supplanted individual effort. Government was centralized, with national planning one of its formalized attributes. Reform seemed to lose its humanitarian, zealous idealism, evolving into a bureaucratic, systematized, practical profession whose organizers were motivated by the dictates of social duty rather than a sense of Christian brotherhood.[4]

This historiographical emphasis on the differences between the two eras is justified in many instances. There is also validity, however, in probing for the antebellum origins of these postwar trends and, alternatively, in determining the post-Appomattox fate of antebellum movements, leaders and ideas. America after the war was a changed nation, but often the war simply hastened trends already begun or redirected existing reform movements. The postwar persistence of labor and woman's rights has already been documented, and these were just two of several movements that spanned the war years. Temperance, purity reform, and various charitable, philanthropic tendencies also flourished on both sides of the dividing line. Abolition itself survived the war in a lively, sometimes divisive battle to win justice and equal rights for newly freed blacks.[5] Before discussing the culmination of abolition during and beyond the war, there will be a brief look at the postwar development of evangelical religion and humanitarian reform -- two lynchpins of the antebellum era.

ii

One scholar of American Protestantism has emphatically stated that the Civil War was the end of an era for evangelicals, and that the "aging . . . evangelists" recognized it.[6] Although massive revivals were not characteristic of the postwar period, undercurrents of evangelicalism did mark the social Christianity movement that began at mid-century and peaked in the Progressive era. The Social Gospel, that "uniquely American movement toward the socializing and ethicizing of Protestantism," represented the attempt of Protestant clergy to find a Christian solution to problems created by industrial capitalism. Progressive and socially ethical in attitude and action, the Social Gospel was counterbalanced (and sometimes outweighed) by an orthodox conservatism which not only rejected the rationalizing influence of science, but which also maintained a theological barrier between the present, real world and God's "otherworldly" kingdom. The theological contrast was crucial. Individual regeneration was the sole aim of the conservatives, and social reorganization outside the scope of their religious philosophy. To social gospellers, on the other hand, personal reformation was "ineffective unless conversion be to a social religion."[7] This rock bottom belief of social Christianity harks back both to Finney and Weld's admonition that "Faith without works is dead," and to the Unitarian philosophy of Theodore Parker, for whom social activism was contingent upon individual conversion.[8] In fact, engrained in Unitarian tradition were many of the same principles stressed in the Social Gospel. Both believed that the Christian church should embrace social responsibility, symbolize the brotherhood of man, and proclaim that the kingdom of God on earth would be recognized by the measure of its social well-being. As well, the stress on social ethics emphasized in the Social Gospel was not a new Protestant outcropping. Preached too by antebellum Unitarians, the "ethical aspects of religion," according to one Social Gospel scholar, had also been "inextricably interwoven" with antebellum movements for abolition, woman's rights, temperance and peace.[9] Thus, while the Social Gospel was defined in great measure by the social, economic and religious conditions of the Gilded Age, it also evinced characteristics of the antebellum period.

The early manifestations of "applied Christianity" began to mature in the 1850's, and to thrive in the immediate postwar years. The popularity of Sir John Seeley's 1866 *Ecce Homo: A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ*, indicates to what extent American attitudes were attuned to social expressions of Christianity. A believer that Jesus' ethics were social, and not just personal, Seeley sought to convince Christians that the dynamic of their morality was the "enthusiasm of humanity," a force which impelled one to "do as much good as possible to every other member."[10] Here Seeley echoed Theodore Parker's definition of the "right kind" of individualism, which embodied as its working principle the motto, "You are as good as I, and let us help one another."[11] Samuel Harris' 1870 lectures to Andover Theological Seminary students paralleled Seeley in their basic assumptions. Harris, whose lecture theme was the earthly kingdom of God, preached that "a redeeming power came down upon humanity from God," and motivated men not only to a new inner life, but also to a just reorganization of society.[12] Both of these men helped move American Protestantism towards a new version of dynamic, humanistic religion with strong ethical and social underpinnings. Evangelical in its dynamism and sense of a righteous, earthly kingdom of God, these early indications of a renewed Protestant theology fruited in the Social Gospel of Washington Gladden and Walter Rauschenbusch.[13]

Although the Social Gospel was undoubtedly rooted in the antebellum traditions of Unitarianism and evangelicalism, scholars agree that its immediate thrust came from "enlightened conservatives" like Horace Bushnell and Henry Beecher (son of Lyman and brother of Harriet and Edward). Yet even Beecher and Bushnell's new theology was tinged with antebellum elements. Beecher, for instance, helped erode the old theology by popularizing the image of a loving God and a compassionate, human Jesus. Imbued with a "romantic optimism" and an "idea of progress," Beecher believed, like the perfectionist evangelists before him, that the kingdom of God could be realized on earth. God's kingdom was not simply spiritual (as the bedrock conservatives said), and it was not just seen in the visible church. It is, said Beecher, "a Christian organization of society . . . effected, sustained, and animated by God, acting in regenerated man."[14] This aspiration of bettering the earthly world was the same dynamic that had fueled antebellum reform. These elements of faith in progress, social ethics, and "dynamic hope" thus bridged the century in antebellum religion and the Progressive Social Gospel. Certainly, antebellum evangelism didn't quietly ease through the war and emerge intact. New ideas and momentous events changed earlier religious practices, attitudes and beliefs. Just as certainly, however, the war didn't suddenly, totally alienate Americans from their religious heritage. Undercurrents of evangelistic perfectionism persisted.

The postwar fate of humanitarianism was similar. The humanitarian impulse, that Christian urge to help the downtrodden, was a mainstay of nearly all antebellum reforms. At its simplest level, humanitarianism was aimed at poor relief, a charitable-philanthropic thrust that entailed giving and doing for others. It is this elemental aspect of humanitarianism that will be discussed in terms of its postwar development.

A recent study of the war years, George Fredrickson's The Inner Civil War, depicts humanitarianism after 1865 as a metamorphosed version of the prewar impulse.[15] The mass carnage of the war itself transformed attitudes towards suffering, and the enormous task of organizing medical services prompted the formation of the United States Sanitary Commission (USSC), the bureaucratic forerunner of the American Red Cross. Utopian idealism, according to this monograph, was no longer the prime motive in these enterprises, but had been replaced by the pressing need to efficiently fix the wounded and quickly send them back into action. Combined with the Social Darwinist climate that prevailed in the 1870's, this intense and direct experience with death and suffering created a new framework for philanthropy. A feeling that the war spirit should endure, that suffering was a real and perhaps beneficial part of life, tinged the philosophy of the new scientific philanthropists. The twin postwar movements of charity organization and scientific benevolence were extensions of the highly organized USSC and outgrowths of the postwar surge of scientific expertise. They superseded the old-fashioned charity that was based on voluntary association, scattershot private giving, and erratic, tenderhearted impulses. Philanthropy in the Gilded Age, however, preferred controlled charity administered by salaried professionals who insured that "worthy self-respecting poverty [was] discovered and relieved at the smallest cost to the benevolent."[16] Philanthropology, the scientific study of the principles and methods of giving, emerged as one of the new applied sciences. The organized charity movement was devoted solely to administrative work, such as placing the needy with a suitable relief agency, or ensuring that duplication of services did not occur. According to Fredrickson, efficiency and centralization were the watchwords of America's postwar philanthropists.

Different philanthropic attitudes and practices did exist in the prewar and postwar periods, but the dichotomy of haphazard, sentimental giving versus hard-nosed, bureaucratic charity can be too sharply delineated. Motivations and methods of giving did not remain static during the century; nonetheless, the two eras evince some important shared characteristics. One factor which helped link the two periods centered on ambivalent feelings about 'giving too much.' Philanthropists and reformers throughout the nineteenth century feared that they would pauperize the poor by doing too much for them, or by maintaining their lives at a subsistence level. Joseph Tuckerman, a prewar exponent of this attitude, and the charity organizers from 1869 on, both chose to give "encouragement and advice" during "friendly visits," rather than "a few scattered pennies."[17] Both ages were torn between the belief that poverty was a virtue (and benevolence the highest of Christian duties), and the suspicion that poverty was the result of weak character or laziness -- tendencies not to be reinforced by gratuitous giving. Each era was marked by generosity and vigorous humanitarianism, and each attempted to direct private giving. Mathew Carey's 1829 attempt to create a central charity agency in Philadelphia failed, but by the 1850's, systematic charitable reform had begun. One modern historian notes that the "large-scale operation[s]" of the American Home Missionary Society, the American Bible Society and the Tract Society, "combined with local, regional, and national disaster relief programs . . . developed systematic methods of tapping [and directing] benevolent resources of the country. . . ." While it is true that the archetypal prewar appeal was to "sentiment, impulse, particularism, and prejudice," this was balanced by reformers in the 1850's who "denounced 'thoughtless liberality' and 'careless relief.'" These reformers also "attempted to make philanthropy an instrument of preventing rather than alleviating need."[18] This move from benevolent giving to treatment of the social causes of poverty was another characteristic common to both eras. Many antebellum reforms, such as abolition, the associative (labor) movement, and Fourierism, sought to reorganize society in order to remove the sources of social and economic injustice. One modern scholar of American philanthropy points out that Charles Loring Brace's 1853 Children's Aid Society "developed a comprehensive program for combatting delinquency at its source."[19] Even earlier, Robert Hartley's 1843 New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, rather than dispensing simple relief, targeted housing, temperance, sanitation and child welfare as prime concerns. This early awareness that environmental causes of poverty must be dealt with was the harbinger of the late nineteenth century trend towards a melding of scientific philanthropy and social reform.

Hartley's "social service" organization not only tried to treat root causes of poverty, but also aimed at coordinating relief for New York City's poor. The New York Association was the outgrowth of an 1843 investigative report that condemned the city's existing relief agencies for their poor performance during the winter of the Bread Riots. The committee criticized their "lack of cooperation, failure to discriminate among the means of relief, and failure to learn the 'wants, capacities, and susceptibilities' of the poor by visiting their homes."[20] After Hartley's coordinating agency began its operations, similar groups in Boston, Baltimore, Brooklyn and Chicago were set up. This tendency towards centralization continued in the 1860's, with the formation of eleven state charity boards between 1863 and 1873. Charged with inspecting and reporting on public welfare institutions, early members included abolitionists Samuel Gridley Howe and John Brown supporter Franklin Sanborn. "Greater efficiency and more humanity"[21] were the goals of the state boards, and these precepts combined the two most salient characteristics of nineteenth century philanthropy.

Clearly, the Civil War caused varying degrees of change to nearly every aspect of American life. Postwar change, however, was not total, sudden and all-pervasive. Based in part on the antebellum heritage of evangelical perfectionism and humanitarianism, the "new" directions of the Gilded Age -- especially towards organized philanthropy and social Christianity -- were in fact amplifications of antebellum innovations.

iii

Abolition, that diverse movement whose most publicized goal was to end slavery, did not passively fade away after the Emancipation Proclamation declared this aim a reality. Nearly all abolitionists believed that legal guarantees of freedom must be amended to the Constitution, and that prejudice and discrimination must be eliminated. Amendments pledging freedom, citizenship, due process and the vote were adopted in 1865, 1868 and 1870. Accompanying each Constitutional addition was a cacophony of political, philosophical and legal wrangling, but the amendments were nonetheless etched into the statute books. No such tangible outcome resulted from abolitionist efforts after Appomattox to end prejudice and discrimination. A consuming task for those whose lives had been dedicated to equality since the 1830's, the old guard fought for equal rights until their deaths in the 1870's and 1880's. In the sense that the abolitionist goal of equality was never achieved, the movement may be called a failure. Yet the abolitionists still living in 1870 could point not only to achievement of immediate abolition, but to "the enlistment of Negro soldiers, government assistance for the education of freedmen, the creation of a Freedmen's Bureau, and the incorporation of the Negro's civil and political equality into the law of the land."[22] These successes ranged from the substantial to the ephemeral. The most effective element of abolition was the very endurance of its long-range aims and their proponents. In fact, the arduous postwar struggle for equality was waged on the basis of early abolitionist ideals. When the old guard began to fade from active reform, their work was continued by a host of second and third generation abolitionists who eventually helped found in 1910 the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), also referred to as the New Abolition Movement.[23] The focus of this study, however, is the first generation of abolitionists, including the fate of the leaders and ideas during and beyond the war.

By the outbreak of the war, considerable realignment had occurred since the 1840 AASS split. Most of the political abolitionists who had formed the Liberty Party chose to merge with the relatively conservative Free Soil movement, which approached slavery in the roundabout way of supporting white western settlement. Many of these former Libertymen later joined the Republican Party, some abandoning their radical ideals, but many adopting the new political party as the most realistic chance for an end to slavery. A handful of Libertymen, as might be expected, were appalled at this weakening of orthodox abolitionism. Gerrit Smith, Frederick Douglass and William Goodell split with their colleagues to establish the Radical Abolitionist Party in 1855. In the prospectus of its newspaper, the Radical Abolitionist, editor Goodell declared that the party wanted immediate abolition on the basis of the "righteous language" of the Constitution, and on the basis of humanity, the ideals of the founding fathers, and a "higher law."[24] Lewis Tappan was also a member of the party, his American & Foreign Anti-Slavery Society having quietly disbanded during the 1850's due to lack of support. Two religious-oriented groups also emerged in the 1850's. The Church Anti-Slavery Society, formed in 1859 after the demise of the A & F, tried to win

Protestant clergy to the side of immediate abolition. Lewis Tappan was the organizational force behind this society, as well as a founder of the American Missionary Association. Tappan's missionary group supported antislavery churches before the war and was intensely involved in freedmen's education afterwards. Like Tappan's A & F, Garrison's AASS also suffered a loss of support, finances and power after 1840. The AASS, however, retained its organizational integrity, and a not inconsiderable influence, until 1870. A group of radical abolitionists who were not aligned with the AASS were the Secret Six, supporters of John Brown's Harper's Ferry raid. Theodore Parker, Gerrit Smith and Samuel Gridley Howe were three who gave Brown money to underwrite his various forays. Brown was buried in upstate New York on one of Gerrit Smith's properties, and the bodies of two of his executed men were buried in New Jersey, near the Welds' school at Eagleswood.[25] James Birney, one of the first of the old guard abolitionists to die, was also buried at Eagleswood, in 1857. Enrolled in the boarding school were many abolitionist offspring, including the children of Henry and Elizabeth Stanton, James Birney and Gerrit Smith. Eagleswood occupied the Welds for most of the 1850's and for Angelina and Sarah, the previous ten years had been consumed in raising three children.[26] Theodore, whose voice temporarily returned in 1841, lectured briefly on the east coast until his larynx again gave out. Although his next public speech would not be for eighteen years, he plunged into abolitionist work again at the request of Emancipator editor Joshua Leavitt. Based in Washington, Leavitt aptly perceived the antislavery leanings of a group of Whig Congressmen, and was determined to bolster it. He pleaded with Weld to act as a researcher, organizer, speechwriter and lobbyist for the small group of men. From 1841-1844, while traditional party lines were being dissolved in the acid of antislavery controversies, Weld was the troubleshooter for the conscience Whigs.[27]

The election of 1860 brought to the fore several factors that forced abolitionists to assess their basic attitudes, goals and practices. Reaction to Lincoln and the Republican Party, for instance, ran the gamut from total acceptance to outright rejection. It was apparent that Lincoln opposed slavery, but also clear that he did not favor social and political equality. As well, conservative Republicans underscored their anti-black sentiments in their arguments advocating white exclusivity in the territories. Abolitionist reaction to these political phenomena was widely divided. Henry B. Stanton, a former Lane rebel often mobbed in the 1830's for his radicalism, stumped for the Republican Party during the 1860's, favoring non-extension and taking care not to alienate voters. Other radicals who allied with the Republicans were equally careful to maintain their radicalism as a counterweight to conservative Republicanism. Joshua Leavitt and Elizur Wright, radical Garrisonians in the early years, saw their role within the party as that of moral conscience. By working within the political system, by constant prodding, they expected to eventually effect the goals of orthodox abolition. Gerrit Smith, who ran for President in 1856 on the Radical Abolition Party ticket, could not abide this groundless hope. He warned that "The calculating policy of non-extension has taken the place of the uncompromising principle of abolition,"[28] and his apprehension was shared by many who had watched political compromise undercut radical demands. Most abolitionists, despite such misgivings, justified a vote for Lincoln on the grounds that his election meant that emancipation would be one step closer to reality. Wendell Phillips, suspicious and persistently critical of Lincoln, typified these mixed reactions when he told a Boston audience that

> If the telegraph speaks the truth, for the first time in our history the slave has chosen a President of the United States. . . . It is the moral effect of this victory, not anything which his administration can or will probably do, that gives value to this success. Not an Abolitionist, hardly an antislavery man, Mr. Lincoln consents to represent an antislavery idea. A pawn on the political chessboard, his value is in his position; with fair effort, we may soon change him for knight, bishop, or queen, and sweep the board.[29]

The overriding feeling was that Lincoln's election was "not the harvest, but . . . the green blade that must go before it."[30]

The surging patriotism that engulfed the North after the attack on Fort Sumter prompted a definition of war aims. Initially a war to reestablish the Union, public pressure for emancipation swelled during 1862. Prominent abolitionists, now being hailed as moral heroes and clear-sighted visionaries, at first withdrew from the emancipation clamor to let the newly-formed Emancipation League lead the outcry. Two of the major New York City newspapers, the Tribune and the Independent, editorialized for emancipation, and the Washington Lecture Association convinced many Congressmen that emancipation was a military, if not a moral necessity.[31] Early in 1862, however, Lincoln still maintained that,

> My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union by freeing any slave, I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that.[32]

Sarah Grimke was just one abolitionist who was deeply disappointed by such conservatism. "It is true," she said, that "there are some who are waging this war to make our Declaration of Independence a fact; there is a glorious band who are fighting for human rights, but the government, with Lincoln at its head has not a heart-throb for the slave." Late in 1862 Angelina wrote a "Declaration of War against Slavery," a petition for total abolition which she finished as Lincoln issued his promised Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863.[33]

Abolitionists gathered together on that day in anticipation of momentous news. Lincoln had pledged such a proclamation in September of 1862, then offered another plan for gradual emancipation in hopes of winning back the South. Abolitionists were thus jubilant at the telegraphed news that the President had not reneged. Garrison called it "a great historic event, sublime in its magnitude, momentous and beneficent in its far-reaching consequences (Liberator, January 2, 1963). Skepticism quickly supplanted the initial joy as abolitionists discovered the conservatism of the document. Instead of universal, immediate abolition, "Lincoln freed the slaves where his edict was inoperative and held them in chains where he could have set them free."[34] Abolitionist opinion was unanimous that freedom for slaves must be written into the Constitution.

Women soon banded together to petition for just such a constitutional amendment. Stanton and Anthony wanted women to squarely face the issues of the war, and to assume responsibility for educating public opinion about a 13th Amendment. To this end they planned a call for a convention that would break ground for a national women's loyal league. Horace Greeley, Theodore Tilton, editor of the New York Independent, Henry Beecher and Robert Dale Owen, a Free Enquirer in the 1830's who now served on the Freedman's Inquiry Commission, urged the women to organize. The convention was held in May, 1863, in New York City, attended by women from all parts of the North. Abby Kelley, the only female abolitionist who would not attend, explained to Anthony that the government "needs strong rebuke instead of unqualified sympathy and support."[35]

Angelina, a keynote speaker, "developed her favorite theme, that ending slavery would mean fulfilling the promise of the Declaration of Independence."[36] The convention enthusiastically endorsed the Conscription Act, and most delegates voted for Anthony's resolution that "There can never be a true peace in this Republic until the civil and political rights of all citizens of African descent and all women are practically established."[37] Anthony was adamant that the government "recognize that it is a war for freedom," and criticized Lincoln for waiting two years before issuing the Emancipation Proclamation.[38] At the closing session Angelina read her "Address to the Soldiers of our Second Revolution," in which she underscored the true causes of the war:

> This war is not . . . a war of races, nor of sections, nor of political parties, but a war of Principles; a war upon the working-classes, whether white or black; a war against Man, the world over. In this war, the black man was the first victim, the working man of whatever color the next; and now all who contend for the rights of labor,

> for free speech, free schools, free suffrage, and a free government . . . are driven to do battle in defense of these or to fall with them. . . .
>
> Soldiers of this revolution, to your hands is committed the sacred duty of carrying out in these latter days the ideals of our fathers, which was to secure to ALL 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.'[39]

The upshot of the convention was formation of the Woman's Loyal National League (WLNL), which set as its sole purpose the overly ambitious, time-consuming task of collecting one million signatures on petitions urging a 13th Amendment. In a year, northern women had sent antislavery Senator Charles Sumner hefty rolls of documents signed by 200,000 people.

In December of 1863, in the founding city of Philadelphia, the AASS held its Third Decade Meeting. The rededication to "the entire and speedy extinction of slavery in every part of the country" was an expected statement, as were two-edged comments welcoming into the abolitionist fold those Americans who had once opposed them. The general tone of the meeting, however, was not one of self-congratulation. Abby Kelley was quick to remind the delegates of past mob action, warning against overconfidence. "It is only by labor, incessant labor," she said, ". . . that we can create such a public sentiment as we need." Kelley and Stone concurred that abolitionist sights must be aimed not at past accomplishments, but at future obstacles. Stone cautioned that "there is a great deal of proslavery sentiment yet to be rooted out. . . . Prejudice against the Negro is to be overcome." Anthony made a personal distinction between the province of "common philanthropy" and the true sphere of abolition when she exhorted her co-workers to "go on with [the] fundamental work of removing the laws which allow the existence of slavery, leaving to others the care of the freedmen and the sick and wounded on the battlefield."[40]

Spirited discussion of the upcoming election peppered convention proceedings, showing a clear split between those who avowedly distrusted Lincoln's motives regarding the future of freedmen, and those who let their enthusiasm for the President cloud minor misgivings. The division of opinion was deepened by the antagonism between Garrison and Phillips over the content and extent of Lincoln's policies. In fact, Phillips boycotted the convention, fearing that premature celebration of freedom would undermine vigilant radicalism. Although Garrison thought the "Administration . . . unnecessarily timid and not undeserving of rebuke," he was sure that Lincoln's treatment of freedmen would be just.[41] Phillips' distrust of Lincoln centered on precisely this point. "The government," resolved Phillips at the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Convention in January, 1864, ". . . is ready to sacrifice the interest and honor of the North to secure a sham peace . . . leaving the freedmen and the Southern States under the control of the late slaveholders." While Garrison praised the Emancipation Proclamation, Phillips harped that "Without fitting measures [it] is worth little to our generation"; and where Garrison lauded enlistment of Negro troops, Phillips acerbically noted that their unequal treatment was "proof that the Government is ready for terms which ignore the rights of the Negro."[42] The Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society adopted Phillips' resolution censuring Lincoln, at the same time rejecting Garrison's motion that they disband now that the 13th Amendment was close to passage. In December, 1865, when the 13th was officially ratified, Garrison greeted the "Jubilee" by ceasing publication of the Liberator. Happy "to be no longer in conflict with the mass of my fellow-countrymen," he told his subscribers in the final issue that

> The object for which the Liberator was commenced -- the extermination of chattel slavery -- having been gloriously consummated, it seems specially appropriate to let its existence cover the historic period of the great struggle; leaving what remains to be done to complete the work of emancipation to other instrumentalities (of which I hope to avail myself), under new auspices, with more abundant means, and with millions instead of hundreds for allies.

Also in 1865, Garrison advocated an end to the AASS. He believed that abolitionists were bound to work for equality, but that the "special work" of the societies had been "the utter annihilation of slavery." This done, the societies should dissolve. Phillips and most other AASS members opposed their president's stance. As Frederick Douglass succinctly said, "The work of the American Anti-Slavery Society will not have been completed until the black men of the South, and the black men of the North, shall have been admitted, fully and completely, into the body politic of America."[43] Garrison left the AASS, Phillips succeeded him as president, and the organization continued until 1870.

One of the most fruitful areas of postwar abolitionist work was freedmen's education. Since the war's beginning local aid groups proliferated to the point where many abolitionists lobbied for creation of a federal agency. The American Freedmen's Inquiry

Commission, headed by Robert Owen and Samuel Gridley Howe, pinpointed education and self-reliance as the double foundations for freedmen's aid. Early in 1865 a Freedmen's Bureau was instituted under the auspices of the War Department. Top positions were held by military men, but several abolitionists were appointed to key positions. Abolitionist input extended beyond personnel, however. The groundwork of the Bureau had been laid by various abolitionist groups, including the Inquiry Commission, the Emancipation League and "abolitionist-dominated freedmen's aid societies."[44] Angelina Grimke Weld worked and lectured to raise money and supplies, and Garrison, months before he ended the Liberator, was elected a vice president of the New-England Freedmen's Aid Society.[45] The New England society was one of the first organizations to send teachers and supplies to the South, an effort that by 1870 saw the establishment in the South of more than one thousand schools for freedmen staffed by over three thousand teachers. Two impulses, both represented in the American Missionary Association, intertwined to accomplish this feat: the "missionary energy of northern Protestantism and the abolitionist desire to uplift the freemen." W. E. B. du Bois called this movement "to plant the New England college in the South . . . the salvation of the South and the Negro."[46]

Education for freedmen was only one way abolitionists sought equality for former slaves. As Susan Anthony had pointed out at the AASS's Third Decade Meeting in 1863, abolitionists must persuade legislators to make equality the law of the land. In 1866, in response to southern hostility to equal rights, Radical Republicans and abolitionists spurred passage of a Civil Rights Act which guaranteed to Negroes "full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for security of person and property, as is enjoyed by white citizens."[47] Opposition from the executive and judicial branches prompted passage of a 14th Amendment in 1866 (ratified in 1868) which embodied the principles of the 1866 Civil Rights Act. The second section of the 14th Amendment, which dealt with the qualifications of voters, contained the infamous reference to "male inhabitants" which dismayed feminist abolitionists. Passage of the 15th Amendment, which gave former (male) slaves the right to vote, cinched the alienation of most feminists, but seemed to insure a political voice for Negroes.

After 1870, when the AASS disbanded, abolitionists -- be they radicals, moderates, Garrisonians, political or evangelical abolitionists -- continued to work in their individual ways for equal rights, treatment and opportunities. During the forty year span between the dissolution of the AASS and the founding of the NAACP, second and third generation descendents pursued their parents' reform goals. The optimism of the 1880's, based in part on a revival of southern liberalism, bred a gradualism among reformers that was supplanted by the militancy of the early 1900's. This was, as historian James McPherson notes, a pattern that paralleled events and tactics of the 1820's and 1830's.[48] Of the numerous white "new abolitionists," it was Garrison's grandson, Oswald Garrison Villard, who took the lead in founding the NAACP. Black and white radicals alike were tired of depending on "time and education" to establish equality. The "new" shift from patience and gradualism to militancy and immediatism was in fact a revival of old-style abolitionism. As Garrison's grandson told an NAACP organizational meeting, "Justice and right must triumph now as they triumphed in Abolition days." The NAACP, says McPherson, started a "crusade for racial justice that looked back to the abolitionist radicalism of the 1860's and forward to the civil rights movement of the 1960's."[49] As the old radical impulse experienced a rebirth in 1910, the evangelical impulse was equally evident in the existence of hundreds of black schools and colleges; and the political achievements of abolitionists, the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, provided the legal foundation for the civil rights struggles of the twentieth century. Laws, schools and a modern national organization to fight for equality were the ultimate fruits of abolition.

iv

The traditional historiographical division that interposes the military and political events of the Civil War between the antebellum era and the Gilded Age-Progressive period creates false impressions about reform. The abolition movement, for instance, although it was the dominant antebellum reform in terms of causing the war, did not therefore "swallow up" other reform movements. Woman's rights and labor agitation prospered beside abolition, maintained an organizational and tactical independence, and continued operations during and after the war. Abolition itself emerged from the crucible of war changed, but not totally transformed. Its original leaders were in the forefront of late nineteenth century struggles for Negro equality. Old guard abolitionists, continuing a pattern of prewar involvement in multiple, related reforms, immersed themselves not only in postwar labor and woman's rights, but also in temperance, purity reform (emancipation of the white slave, as they described it), philanthropy and Indian reform. Undercurrents of humanitarianism and evangelical perfectionism buoyed postwar movements which were, at the same time, developing bureaucratic methods and impersonal, statistical outlooks.

The complexities of reform traditions do not always neatly dovetail with political, military or economic concerns. Rather than breaking up the nineteenth century into two distinct reform periods located and labeled in relation to the Civil War, study of a middle period, focusing on the span 1850-1880, would surely disclose a truer view of reform developments. Several recent monographs have attempted such an approach, showing that the Civil War did not put an end to antebellum reforms, or to their leaders and philosophies.

Nineteenth century reform was certainly not a homogenized entity, but there *was* a definite continuity within the reform heritage based on the ideals engrained in the Declaration of Independence. To the reformers of the 1830's, especially the abolitionists, the rhetoric of the Declaration acted as the lynchpin of their philosophy. Because it provided an inherited sanction for closing the gap between national principles and practices, the Declaration was the one document they persistently cited as justification for agitation. In a sense, reform in America has sought to effect the true meaning of the Declaration's rhetoric, to match reality with its lofty ideals. A hope expressed by Martin Luther King in 1963 might well have been spoken a hundred years earlier by Garrison, Phillips or a Grimke: "I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal.'"[50] It is the vision of equality and personal freedom projected by the Declaration of Independence that has provided the deepest sense of continuity, justification and motivation for American reform.

NOTES: CONCLUSION

[1] Branch, Sentimental Years, p. 419.

[2] James is quoted in Fredrickson, Inner Civil War, prologue, and Brownson on p. 187.

[3] Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 657, states that "Romantic reform ended with the Civil War. . . ." Branch, Sentimental Years, p. 419, concurs. Fredrickson, ibid., p. 199, states that at the end of the war, ". . . the nation turned its back on humanitarian reform. . . ." Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, p. 222, believes "that the Civil War marked the end of their [the evangelists'] era."

[4] Historians who view the Civil War as a turning point in political, economic or intellectual terms, and thus concentrate on the changes in postwar America, are discussed in the intro., n. 6, above.

[5] The relationship between abolition and postwar woman's rights has been dealt with above, pp. 154-164 , and labor has been similarly treated above, on pp. 88-93, and pp. 95-98, passim. Temperance, a movement that was closely linked in leadership, ideas and strategy to both abolition and woman's rights, is the subject of John Kobler, Ardent Spirits: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition (New York, 1973). Ernest H. Cherrington, The Evolution of Prohibition in the United States of America (Westerville, Ohio, 1920; Montclair, N. J., 1969), reprint ed., remains one of the standards on temperance and prohibition. Pivar's Purity Crusade is a modern study of the purity movement which points out the antebellum antecedents as well as the later nineteenth century developments of the purity crusade. Mardock's Reformers and the American Indian also makes a particular effort to uncover the early reform backgrounds (often abolitionist) of postwar Indian reformers. One scholar who has written several books and articles on nineteenth century philanthropy is Robert Bremner. See his American Philanthropy (Chicago, Ill., 1960) or "The Impact of the Civil War on Philanthropy and Social Welfare," CWH 12: 293-303. James McPherson, in Struggle For Equality and Abolitionist Legacy delves into the history of abolition from 1860-1912.

[6] Cole, Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, p. 222. The last great revivals were in 1859 and 1863. See May, Protestant Churches, p. 39.

[7] Hopkins, Rise of the Social Gospel, p. 16. The previous quote is located on p. vii. In addition to Hopkins and May, Protestant Churches, my main sources for the Social Gospel were Gabriel, Course of American Democratic Thought, chap. 20; Wish, Society and Thought in Modern America, chap. 7; and Gutman, "Protestantism and the American Labor Movement: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age."

[8] Parker is discussed above on p. 14, pp. 22-23 (n. 37 and n. 38), p.106, n. 35; and on pp. 80-81, below.

[9] Hopkins, Rise of the Social Gospel, p. 7.

[10] Quoted in ibid., p. 23.

[11] Quoted in Thomas, "Romantic Reform," p. 673.

[12] Quoted in Hopkins, Rise of the Social Gospel, p. 21.

[13] According to Wish, Society and Thought in Modern America, p. 164, Gladden believed that since slavery was abolished, men must next make an effort to emancipate labor.

[14] Beecher's quotes can be found in Hopkins, Rise of the Social Gospel, p. 20.

[15] Fredrickson, Inner Civil War, chaps. 6-8 and 11-14 deal with responses to suffering, the moral equivalent of war, the impact of science on American intellectuals, and "The Twilight of Humanitarianism." Fredrickson's occasional brilliant insights are backed by careful research, but he tends to reduce the antebellum era to a simplistic stereotype, then pit this stereotype against the sharply-cast change of the postwar period. For instance, Fredrickson writes on p. 128 that, "The war situation had apparently made the moral reformer as much an anachronism as the tenderhearted humanitarian who had been superseded by the practical and 'realistic' Sanitary Commissioner." Fredrickson not only doesn't mention antebellum attempts at organized charity but, less understandably, devotes only half a page (p. 107) to the USSC's great rival, the Christian Commission. An evangelical organization whose members had been active in the American Bible Society, American Tract Society, and the Sunday School and temperance movements, the Christian Commission was a soul-saving and relief organization that was roughly equal to the USSC in size, funding and grass-roots organization. The Christian Commission, quite unlike the USSC, depended on zealous, devoted volunteers who eschewed the rules and red tape of the USSC to personally deliver supplies and religious tracts to the front. Robert Bremner, in "The Impact of the Civil War on Philanthropy and Social Welfare," pp. 293-303, gives a more balanced view of the two commissions. Both organizations continued work after the war, with the USSC expanding "old campaigns for public health, reform of public charities, and a more systematic organization of private charity." The Christian Commission, on the other hand, directed its efforts towards "foreign and domestic missions, especially missions to the Indian tribes, religious evangelism, vice crusades, and education for the freedmen." (Bremner, p. 303). To be sure, contrasts between the two commissions did exist. But Fredrickson, with the zeal he attributes to the "tenderhearted humanitarians," so concentrates on the contrasts between eras that some distortion occurs.

[16] Bremner, American Philanthropy, p. 98. Josephine Shaw Lowell, sister of slain Civil War hero Robert Gould Shaw and widow of James Russell Lowell's nephew Charles, was an outstanding leader of the organized charity movement. She co-founded the New York Charity Organization Society, which was "devoted to building character rather than relieving need." In 1889, affected by the plight of laborers, she stopped her charity work to devote time to the working classes. As she put it, "It is better to save them before they go under, than to spend your life fishing them out when they're half drowned and taking care of them afterwards," Bremner, p. 103. Bremner discusses Lowell on pp. 100-103.

[17] Ibid., p. 98. Tuckerman is dealt with on p. 70 above, and in Branch, Sentimental Years, p. 195.

[18] Bremner, "The Impact of the Civil War on Philanthropy and Social Welfare," p. 294.

[19] Bremner, American Philanthropy, p. 63.

[20] Branch, Sentimental Years, p. 196.

[21] Bremner, American Philanthropy, p. 95. On p. 98, Bremner notes that "Jewish welfare agencies had joined in Philadelphia in 1870 and in New York in 1874 to form the United Hebrew Charities, and during the depression charitable societies in larger cities made some efforts to cooperate in detecting imposters and rounders."

[22] McPherson, Struggle for Equality, p. 430. Supplemented by letters, speeches and convention documents, McPherson is the main secondary source for the discussion of abolitionism during and after the war.

[23] McPherson, Abolitionist Legacy, p. 5. On the following page, McPherson offers this definition of 1st, 2d and 3d generation abolitionists: "A first generation abolitionist was one who joined the movement before 1860 and whose parents are not known to have been active in the post-1830 phase of militant abolitionism; a second generation abolitionist was the son or daughter of such a person; and a third-generation abolitionist was the grandson or granddaughter of a first-generation abolitionist." The Pennsylvania Abolition Society, founded in 1775, still exists, committed to "Improving the Condition of the African Race." See the Pennsylvania Historial Society microfilm guide, p. 16.

[24] Radical Abolitionist, June, 1855. Another signer of the convention call was George Whipple, a Lane rebel who was famous for his work in Indian reform. The Radical Abolitionist's masthead read, "Proclaim Liberty Throughout All The Land, unto All The Inhabitants Thereof." This quote from Leviticus was also used by the Liberator and is inscribed on the Liberty Bell.

[25] McPherson, in Struggle for Equality, pp. 5-6, discusses these regroupings of abolitionists from 1850 to the war. Henry Stanton, Elizur Wright and Joshua Leavitt all moved from the Liberty Party into the free soil coalition, and from there to the Republican Party. The Secret Six were Samuel Gridley Howe and Franklin Sanborn, who both later served on the Freedmen's Inquiry Commission, Gerrit Smith, who suffered a nervous breakdown after his involvement with Brown was made public, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, George Stearns and Theodore Parker. Gerald Sorin, in The New York Abolitionists: A Case Study of Political Radicalism (Westport, Conn., 1971), deals in detail with Smith's relationship with Brown. For the Welds' part in the burial of Brown's men, see Thomas, Theodore Weld, p. 237.

[26] The Weld ménage à trois, according to Lumpkin, Emancipation of Angelina Grimke, was characterized by psychological struggles which help explain why Angelina retreated from public life after marriage. Lumpkin feels that Weld's well-documented abhorence of publicity caused him to spurn the usual "human satisfactions." Weld believed that pride in his fame would undermine his "goal of the Christlike life," Lumpkin, p. 161. His 1837 criticism of firebrand Henry C. Wright is thought to be an implied criticism of Angelina's 1830's lecture career: ". . . exhibitions of personal vanity, ostentatious display, . . . an overweening restlessness to show oneself . . . have from childhood so excited my disgust and loathing that language cannot express the repulsion they excite in my soul." Is it possible, Weld wanted to know, that Wright's ostentatious way of doing things, "so apparently vain, . . . printing ones name /as a by-line to abolitionist articles/ so prodigally as to make it an almost omnipresent visibility . . . is ACCORDING TO YOUR TASTE?" (See Barnes and Dumond, Weld-Grimke Letters, 1: 454-455). In 1843 Weld and Sarah openly admonished Angelina for her "sinful" love of applause. Angelina felt she was "judged . . . very harshly," but acknowledged that her "restless, ambitious temper, so different from dear Sister's, craves high duties and high attainments. . . ." (See Lumpkin, pp. 185-186 and Weld-Grimke Letters, 2: 649-651). When Angelina was invited to lecture, she was cautioned to wait until she was sure it was God who called, and not ambition. Aside from psychological tensions, Angelina was kept from the public platform by the birth of three children (and a debilitating miscarriage) between 1839 and 1844. Twice before marriage she told Weld that "I do not love the society of children. . . . This no doubt marks a moral defect in my character," Lumpkin, p. 186). Sarah, whose fame as a speaker never matched her sister's, moved in with the Welds soon after their marriage, and reared the children. In an unpublished letter she wrote, "I have sometimes tasted exquisite joys and have found a solace for many a woe in the innocence and earnest love of Theodore's children," (my emphasis), Lumpkin, p. 187. While Weld was away in Washington, Sarah regularly appended her sister's letters with reports of Angelina's progress in handling the children. In 1854, just before their move to Eagleswood, Angelina wrote to Sarah that their relationship was "destructive." The following January, settled in New Jersey, was "the happiest winter I have spent since my marriage." Angelina felt "relieved of the heavy

load it [her mind] has had to carry in secret, silent bitterness for many years." (See Lumpkin, pp. 202-203). It was during the 1850's that Angelina quietly re-entered public life.

[27] Thomas, *Theodore Weld*, chap. 14, gives a full treatment of Weld's Washington years. Weld's biographer notes that Weld converted to abolitionism three key antislavery Congressman, Joshua Giddings (p. 193), Seth Gates (p. 194) and Sherlock Andrews (p. 195).

[28] Quoted in McPherson, *Struggle for Equality*, p. 18.

[29] Wendell Phillips, *Speeches and Lectures*, 1st ser., p. 294.

[30] Quoted in McPherson, *Struggle for Equality*, p. 27.

[31] See ibid., chap. 4.

[32] Quoted in Lutz, *Crusade for Freedom*, p. 283.

[33] Sarah is quoted in Birney, *Grimke Sisters*, pp. 284-285. Angelina's "Declaration of War against Slavery" has not survived. Birney mentions it on p. 285 and Lerner, *Grimke Sisters from South Carolina*, on p. 355.

[34] T. Harry Williams, *Lincoln and the Radicals* (Madison, Wisc., 1941), p. 216.

[35] Quoted in Lutz, *Crusade for Freedom*, p. 284. Lutz deals with the WLNL on pp. 283-288.

[36] Lerner, *Grimke Sisters from South Carolina*, p. 352.

[37] There was considerable debate of Anthony's resolution, which linked the rights of Negroes and women. See Stanton, *History of Woman Suffrage*, 2: 57-66. Two women opposed the resolution. Sarah Halleck of New York wanted the "objectionable" part "to be stricken out" because "the negroes [sic.] have suffered more than the women," p. 60. Mrs. Hoyt of Wisconsin, representing the West, did not oppose "the sentiment" expressed in the resolution, but did not want to "prejudice" the antislavery cause by "tack[ing] on" an "ism" that was "obnoxious to the people. The one idea should be the maintenance of the authority of the Government . . ." (p. 60). Anthony countered that "advancement of the loyal cause" meant that "true democracy" must be established. "You remember the maxim, 'Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.' This is the fundamental principle of democracy -- . . . The civil and political rights of every citizen must be practically established," pp. 60-62. Ernestine Rose and Lucy Stone also argued that being loyal entailed seeking "justice" for "Negroes and women." Rose found it "exceedingly amusing to hear persons talk about throwing out Woman's Rights, when if it had not been for Woman's Rights, that lady [Mrs. Hoyt] would not have had the courage to stand here and say what she did," p. 64.

These opposing opinions echo the debate between Angelina Grimke and Theodore Weld over the injection of woman's rights into the abolitionist cause.

[38] The resolution drafted by Anthony is reprinted in ibid., p. 66.

[39] Reprinted in ibid., pp. 890-891.

[40] The quotes from the Third Decade Meeting can all be found in Lutz, Crusade for Freedom, pp. 289-291.

[41] Garrison is quoted in Fredrickson, ed., William Lloyd Garrison (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1968), p. 66. McPherson, Struggle for Equality, chap. 13, contains a balanced assessment of the rift between Garrison and Phillips.

[42] McPherson, Struggle for Equality, p. 261. Phillips' two previous quotes are located respectively on p. 260 and p. 179.

[43] Quoted in ibid., p. 288. Garrison's quote is on p. 287. Garrison was frequently lionized after the war for the far-sighted, moral stand he had taken so early against slavery. It is possible that this mass acceptance dulled his radicalism, although he fervently worked for freedmen's education after the war and was adamantly opposed to Andrew Johnson. Garrison died in 1879.

[44] McPherson, Struggle for Equality, p. 191. The ideas expressed above concerning the origins of the Freedmen's Bureau are McPherson's. McPherson emphasizes that "It is probable that some kind of a bureau would have been established without abolitionist urging, but much of the credit for the liberal features of the Freedmen's Bureau bill must go to the abolitionists."

[45] See Walter M. Merrill, Against Wind and Tide: A Biography of Wm. Lloyd Garrison (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), p. 312 for details of Garrison's postwar work, and Lerner, Grimke Sisters from South Carolina, p. 356, for the same concerning Angelina. Sarah died in 1873, Angelina in 1879, and Theodore in 1895.

[46] Quoted in Abolitionist Legacy, p. 160. The previous quote is on p. 143 and is McPherson's. He notes that the American Missionary Association schools survived the depression in the 1870's because "they were firmly rooted in the institutional structure of American Protestantism," p. 148.

[47] C. Vann Woodward, "Equality, the Deferred Commitment," in Harold D. Woodman, ed., The Legacy of the American Civil War (New York, 1974), p. 161.

[48] See p. 393 of Abolitionist Legacy for an explanation of

McPherson's cyclical theory of reform. Chapter 20 focuses on the end of gradualism and the founding of the NAACP.

[50] Martin Luther King, "I Have a Dream," Address at the March on Washington, reprinted in Woodman, Legacy of the American Civil War, p. 208. President Carter reiterated this sentiment in his inaugural address: "Two centuries ago our nation's birth was a milestone in the long quest for freedom, but the bold and brilliant dream which excited the founders of our nation still awaits its consummation. I have no new dream today, but rather urge a fresh faith in the old dream." The President's speech is reprinted in the New York Times, January 21, 1977.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Edith. Women in Industry: A Study in American Economic History. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1910; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1969.

Abzug, Robert. "The Influence of Garrisonian Abolitionists' Fears of Slave Violence on the Anti-Slavery Movement." Journal of Negro History 55 (1970): 15-28.

Adams, Alice Dana. The Neglected Period of Anti-Slavery in America, 1808-1831. [Cambridge, Mass.]: Radcliffe College, 1908; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1964.

Adams, Ephraim Douglass. The Power of Ideals in American History. n.p., 1913; reprint ed., Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1969.

Ash, Roberta. Social Movements in America. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1972.

Banner, Lois. "Religion and Reform in the Early Republic: The Role of Youth." American Quarterly 23 (1971): 677-695.

Barnes, Gilbert Hobbs. The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1933.

Barnes, Gilbert Hobbs and Dumond, Dwight Lowell, eds. Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimke Weld and Sarah Grimke: 1822-1844. 2 vols. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1934.

Bartlett, Irving. "Wendell Phillips and the Eloquence of Abuse." American Quarterly 11 (1959): 509-520.

________. Wendell Phillips: Brahmin Radical. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.

Becker, Carl. The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922; reprint ed., New York: Peter Smith, 1940.

Birney, Catherine H. The Grimke Sisters: Sarah and Angelina Grimke, The First American Women Advocates of Abolition and Woman's Rights. [Boston]: Lee & Shepard, 1885; reprint ed., Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1969.

Bottomore, T. B. Critics of Society: Radical Thought in North America. New York: Random House, 1968.

Branch, Edward Douglas. The Sentimental Years: 1836-1860. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1934.

Bremner, Robert H. American Philanthropy. Chicago History of American Civilization Series. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

________. "The Impact of the Civil War on Philanthropy and Social Welfare." Civil War History 12 (1966): 293-303.

Cherrington, Ernest H. The Evolution of Prohibition in the United States of America: A Chronological History. n.p., 1920; reprint ed., Montclair, N.J.: Patterson Smith, 1969.

Cole, Charles C., Jr. The Social Ideas of Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Commager, Henry Steele. Theodore Parker: Yankee Crusader. 2d ed. Boston: Beacon Press, 1947.

Commons, John R.; Saposs, David J.; Sumner, Helen L.; Mittelman, E. B.; Hoagland, H. E.; Andrews, John B.; and Perlman, Selig. History of Labour in the United States. 4 vols. New York: Macmillan Co., 1918.

Cooper, Frederick. "Elevating the Race: The Social Thought of Black Leaders, 1827-1850." American Quarterly 24 (1972): 604-625.

Craven, Avery. The Coming of the Civil War. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Cross, Whitney R. The Burned-over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1950.

Curti, Merle. The Growth of American Thought. 2d ed. New York: Harper & Bros., 1943.

Davis, David Brion. "The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought." Mississippi Valley Historical Review 49 (1962): 209-230.

________, ed. Ante-Bellum Reform. Interpretations of American History Series. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Degler, Carl N. Out of Our Past: Forces that Shaped Modern America. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Dillon, Merton L. "The Failure of the American Abolitionists." Journal of Southern History 25 (1959): 159-177.

Dillon, Merton L. The Abolitionists: The Growth of a Dissenting Minority. DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1974.

Duberman, Martin B. "The Abolitionists and Psychology." Journal of Negro History 47 (1962): 183-191.

________, ed. The Antislavery Vanguard: New Essays on the Abolitionists. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Dulles, Foster R. Labor in America: A History. 3d ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1966.

Dumond, Dwight Lowell. Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1939.

Eaton, Clement. The Freedom-of-Thought Struggle in the Old South. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1940.

Ekirch, Arthur Alphonse, Jr. The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860. [New York]: Columbia University Press, 1944; reprint ed., New York: Peter Smith, 1951.

Elkins, Stanley M. Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional Life. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

________. "The Slavery Debate." Commentary 60 (December 1975): 40-54.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. Complete Works. 11 vols. Vol. 1: Nature, Addresses and Lectures. Riverside edition. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1883-1887.

________. Essays and Journals. Compiled and introduced by Lewis Mumford. Garden City, N.Y.: International Collectors Library, 1968.

Filler, Louis. The Crusade Against Slavery, 1830-1860. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Flexnor, Eleanor. Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Fredrickson, George M. The Inner Civil War: Northern Intellectuals and the Crisis of Union. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

________, ed. William Lloyd Garrison. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Furnas, J. C. The Americans: A Social History of the United States, 1587-1914. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.

Gabriel, Henry. The Course of American Democratic Thought. 2d ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1940.

Garrison, William Lloyd. Thoughts on African Colonization. /Boston, 1832/; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1968.

________. Selections from the Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison. /Boston/: R. F. Wallcut, 1840; reprint ed., New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968.

________. The Words of Garrison. Compiled by Wendell Phillips Garrison and Francis Jackson Garrison. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1905.

Griffin, Clifford S. "The Abolitionists and the Benevolent Societies, 1831-1861." Journal of Negro History 44 (1959): 195-216.

Grimke, Angelina. Slavery in America. A reprint of an Appeal to the Christian Women of the Slave States of America. Introduction, notes and appendix by George Thompson. n.p., /1836/. Haverford College rare books collection.

________. Appeal to the Christian Women of the South. n.p. /1836/. Haverford College.

________. Letters to Catherine Beecher, in Reply to an Essay on Slavery and Abolitionism, addressed to A. E. Grimke. Revised by the author. Boston: I. Knapp, 1838.

Grimke, Sarah Moore. An Epistle to the Clergy of the Southern States. New York: n.p., 1836. Haverford College.

Gutman, Herbert G. "Protestantism and the American Labor Movement: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age." American Historical Review 72 (1966-1967): 74-101.

________. Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1976.

Harbinger. 1845-1847.

Hays, Samuel P. The Response to Industrialism, 1885-1914. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Higham, John. "The Cult of American Consensus: Homogenizing Our History." Commentary 27 (February 1959): 93-100.

Hofstadter, Richard. *The American Political Tradition*. New York: Random House, 1965.

Holbrook, Stewart H. *Dreamers of the American Dream*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1957.

Hollingsworth, J. Rogers. "Consensus and Continuity in Recent American Historical Writing." *South Atlantic Quarterly* (winter 1962): 40-50.

Hopkins, Charles Howard. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915*. Yale Studies in Religious Education, no. 14. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1940.

Hudson, Winthrop S. *Religion in America*. 2d ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973.

Hugins, Walter. *Jacksonian Democracy and the Working Class: A Study of the Workingmen's Movement, 1829-1837*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1960.

Jordan, Winthrop D. *The White Man's Burden: Historical Origins of Racism in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Keniston, Kenneth. "Youth: A 'New' Stage of Life." *American Scholar* 39 (1970): 631-653.

Kobler, John. *Ardent Spirits: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1973.

Kraditor, Aileen S. *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism: Garrison and his Critics on Strategy and Tactics, 1834-1850*. New York: Random House, 1969.

________. *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1971.

________, ed. *Up From the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism*. Introduction by Aileen Kraditor. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968.

Krout, John Allen. *The Origins of Prohibition*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1925; reprint ed., New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.

Kurtz, Paul, ed. *American Thought Before 1900: A Sourcebook, from Puritanism to Darwinism*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Lader, Lawrence. *The Bold Brahmins: New England's War Against Slavery, 1831-1863*. New York: Dutton & Co., 1961.

Lens, Sidney. *Radicalism in America*. Rev. ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1969.

Lerner, Gerda. *The Grimke Sisters From South Carolina: Rebels Against Slavery*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.

Liberator. 1831-1865.

Lofton, William H. "Abolition and Labor: 1. The Appeal of the Abolitionists to the Northern Working Classes; 2. The Reaction of Northern Labor to the Antislavery Appeal." *Journal of Negro History* 33 (1948): 249-283.

Lumpkin, Katherine DuPre. *The Emancipation of Angelina Grimke*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1974.

Lutz, Alma. *Crusade for Freedom: Women of the Antislavery Movement*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

McMaster, John Bach. *The Acquisition of Political, Social and Industrial Rights of Man in America*. n.p., [1903]; reprint ed., New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1961.

McPherson, James M. *The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964.

________. *The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Mandel, Bernard. *Labor, Free and Slave: Workingmen and the Antislavery Movement in the United States*. New York: Associated Authors, 1955.

Mardock, Robert Winston. *The Reformers and the American Indian*. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1971.

Mathews, Donald G. "The Abolitionists on Slavery: The Critique Behind the Social Movement." *Journal of Southern History* 33 (1967): 163-182.

May, Henry F. *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949.

________. "The End of American Radicalism." *American Quarterly* 2 (1950): 291-302.

Maynard, Douglas H. "The World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 47 (1960): 452-471.

Merrill, Walter M. Against Wind and Tide: A Biography of William Lloyd Garrison. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Merrill, Walter M., and Ruchames, Louis, eds. The Letters of William Lloyd Garrison. 4 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Miller, Perry, ed. American Thought: Civil War to World War I. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1954.

Montgomery, David. "The Working Classes of the Pre-Industrial City, 1780-1830." Labor History 9 (1968): 3-22.

Moore, R. Laurence, ed. The Emergence of an American Left: Civil War to World War I. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

National Anti-Slavery Standard. 1840-1871.

National Enquirer. 1836.

National Women's Rights Convention. Proceedings of the National Women's Rights Convention Held at Cleveland, Ohio, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, October, 5, 6, 7, 1853. Cleveland: Gary, Beardsley, Spear & Co., 1854.

Nye, Russell B. William Lloyd Garrison and the Humanitarian Reformers. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1955.

________. Society and Culture in America, 1830-1860. The New American Nation Series. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

O'Connor, Lillian. Pioneer Women Orators: Rhetoric in the Antebellum Reform Movement. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

O'Neill, William. Everyone Was Brave: The Rise and Fall of Feminism in America. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969.

Ostrander, Gilman M. The Rights of Man in America, 1606-1861. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1960.

Pease, Jane H., and Pease, William H. "Antislavery Ambivalence: Immediatism, Expediency, and Race." American Quarterly 17 (1965): 262-295.

________. "Ends, Means and Attitudes: Black-White Conflict in the Antislavery Movement." Civil War History 18 (1972): 117-128.

________. They Who Would Be Free: Blacks' Search for Freedom, 1830-1861. Studies in American Negro Life. New York: Atheneum, 1974.

Pennsylvania Abolition Society Collection. *Correspondence of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, 1836-1839*. Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, microfilm publication, 1976.

Perry, Lewis. *Radical Abolitionism: Anarchy and the Government of God in Antislavery Thought*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Pessen, Edward. "The Workingman's Movement of the Jacksonian Era." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 43 (1956): 428-443.

________. *Most Uncommon Jacksonians: The Radical Leaders of the Early Labor Movement*. Albany, N.Y.: The State University of New York, 1967.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Autograph Collection of Simon Gratz and Notable American Women Manuscript Collection: Angelina and Sarah Grimke Letters.

Phillips, Wendell. *Speeches, Lectures and Letters*. 1st ser. [Boston]: Lee & Shepard, 1884; reprint ed., New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968.

________. *Speeches, Lectures and Letters*. 2d ser. Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1891.

Pivar, David J. *Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868-1900*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1973.

Quarles, Benjamin. "Sources of Abolitionist Income." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 32 (1945): 63-76.

________. *Black Abolitionists*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Radical Abolitionist. 1855-1858.

Rayback, Joseph G. "The American Workingman and the Antislavery Crusade." *Journal of Economic History* 3 (1943): 152-163.

________. *A History of American Labor*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959.

Riegel, Robert E. *Young America, 1830-1840*. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1949.

________. *American Women: A Story of Social Change*. Teaneck, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1970.

Rossi, Alice S., ed. The Feminist Papers: From Adams to deBeauvoir. Introduction by Alice S. Rossi. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.

Rozwenc, Edwin C. The Making of American Society: An Institutional and Intellectual History of the United States. 2 vols. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1972.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. The American As Reformer. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. and Fox, Dixon Ryan, eds. A History of American Life. 12 vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944. Vol. 5: The Completion of Independence, 1790-1830, by John Allen Krout and Dixon Ryan Fox.

Schluter, Herman. Lincoln, Labor and Slavery: A Chapter from the Social History of America. New York: Russell & Russell, 1965.

Seldes, Gilbert. The Stammering Century. /New York/: The John Day Co., Inc., 1928; reprint ed., New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Simms, Henry H. Emotion at High Tide: Abolition as a Controversial Factor, 1830-1845. Richmond, Va.: The William Byrd Press, Inc., 1960.

Sorin, Gerald. The New York Abolitionists: A Case Study of Political Radicalism. Contributions in American History, no. 11. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1971.

Smith, Page. Daughters of the Promised Land: Women in American History. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970.

Smith, Timothy L. Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth Century America. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady; Anthony, Susan B.; Gage, Matilda Joslyn; and Harper, Ida Husted, eds. History of Woman Suffrage. 6 vols. New York: Fowler & Wells, 1881-1922; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1969.

Stearns, Bertha M. "Reform Periodicals and Female Reformers, 1830-1860." American Historical Review 37 (1932): 678-699.

Stein, Leon, and Taft, Philip, eds. Religion, Reform, and Revolution: Labor Panaceas in the Nineteenth Century. American Labor: From Conspiracy to Collective Bargaining Series. New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1970.

Stewart, James Brewer. "The Aims and Impact of Garrisonian Abolitionists, 1840-1860." Civil War History 15 (1969): 197-209.

________. "Peaceful Hopes and Violent Experiences: The Evolution of Reforming and Radical Abolitionism, 1831-1837." Civil War History 17 (1971): 293-309.

________. "Politics and Belief in Abolitionism: Stanley Elkins' Concept of Antiinstitutionalism and Recent Interpretations of American Antislavery." South Atlantic Quarterly (winter 1976): 74-97.

Sweet, William Warren. The Story of Religion in America. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1950.

Sylvis, James C., ed. The Life, Speeches, Labors and Essays of William H. Sylvis. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1872; reprint ed., New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1968.

Taft, Philip. Organized Labor in American History. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Thomas, Benjamin P. Theodore Weld: Crusader For Freedom. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1950.

Thomas, John L. The Liberator: William Lloyd Garrison. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1963.

________. "Romantic Reform in America, 1815-1865." American Quarterly 17 (1965): 656-681.

Tyler, Alice Felt. Freedom's Ferment: Phases of American Social History from the Colonial Period to the Outbreak of the Civil War. New York: Harper & Row, 1944.

Unger, Irwin. "The 'New Left' and American History: Some Recent Trends in United States Historiography." American Historical Review 72 (July 1967): 1237-1263.

Welter, Barbara. "Anti-Intellectualism and the American Woman, 1800-1860." Mid-America 48 (1966): 258-270.

________. "The Cult of True Womanhood, 1820-1860." American Quarterly 18 (1966): 151-174.

Welter, Rush. The Mind of America, 1820-1860. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.

Whitridge, Arnold. *No Compromise! The Story of the Fanatics Who Paved the Way to the Civil War*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1960.

Williams, T. Harry. *Lincoln and the Radicals*. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1941.

Wish, Harvey. *Society and Thought in America*. 2 vols. Vol. 1: *Society and Thought in Early America: A Social and Intellectual History of the American People Through 1865*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1950.

Woman's Rights Convention. *The Proceedings of the Woman's Rights Convention, Held at Worcester, October 23d & 24th, 1850*. Boston: Prentiss & Sawyer, 1851. Schlesinger Library at Radcliffe College.

Woodman, Harold D., ed. *The Legacy of the American Civil War*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. "Abolitionism: Its Meaning for Contemporary American Reform." *Midwest Quarterly* 8 (1966): 41-55.

________. "Stanley Elkins' *Slavery*: The Antislavery Interpretation Reexamined." *American Quarterly* 25 (1973): 154-175.

________. *Lewis Tappan and the Evangelical War Against Slavery*. New York: Atheneum, 1971.

Young, Alfred F., ed. *Dissent: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*. DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1968.